DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 332 PS 002 833

AUTHOR	HESS, ROBERT D.; AND OTHERS
TITLE	PARENTAL BEHAVIOR AND CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR HEAD START. PROCEEDINGS OF THE HEAD START RESEARCH SEMINARS: SEMINAR NO. 5, INTERVENTION IN FAMILY LIFE (1ST, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 13, 1969).
INSTITUTION	EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, WASHINGTON, D.C.
REPORT NO	OEO-4098-SEMINAR-5
PUB DATE	13 JAN 69
NOTE	119P.; THIS SEMINAR IS PART OF THE COMPLETE PROCEEDINGS: (ED 034 088) "CRITICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCH RELATED TO DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN," EDITED BY EDITH GROTBERG
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$6.05
DESCRIPTORS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT, COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *FAMILY LIFE, *INTERVENTION, PARENT CHILD RELATIONSHIP, PARENT INFLUENCE, PARENT PARTICIPATION, PARENT ROLE
IDENTIFIERS	*HEAD START

ABSTRACT

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS THE THREE PAPERS THAT COMPRISED THE HEAD START RESEARCH SEMINAR NO. 5 ON INTERVENTION IN FAMILY LIFE. THE MAIN THRUST OF THIS SEMINAR IS THE INVESTIGATION OF FAMILY AND PARENT CHARACTERISTICS THAT INFLUENCE THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN. ROBERT HESS, IN THE OPENING PAPER, SUMMARIZES THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON THE SUBJECT, REVIEWS THE EVIDENCE FOR SOCIAL CLASS AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN PARENTAL BEHAVIOR, SKETCHES THE CONCEPTIONS OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN FEATURES OF THE SOCIETY AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT, AND SPECULATES ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ABOVE FOR HEAD START. A SUMMARY OF STUDIES MADE FROM 1945 TO 1969 OF PARENTAL INFLUENCES ON CHILDREN'S ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR IS INCLUDED, WITH BIBLIOGRAPHY. THE SECOND PAPER, BY IRA GORDON, COMMENTS ON HESS' PAPER AND EXPANDS ON IT. GORDON CLASSIFIES THE FACTORS INFLUENCING CHILD DEVELOPMENT AS EITHER DEMOGRAPHIC, PARENTAL-COGNITIVE, OR PARENTAL-EMOTIONAL AND DISCUSSES IN DETAIL SEVERAL FACTORS IN EACH CATEGORY. HIS INVESTIGATION OF THESE FACTORS LEADS HIM TO ENUNCIATE THE IDEA OF PARENT POWER IN PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION. IN THE FINAL PAPER, DANIEL SCHEINFELD DISCUSSES THE CHANGES THAT MUST BE MADE IN PARENTS AND HOME LIFE TO INSURE MORE ADVANTAGEOUS DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CHILDREN. IN ORDER FOR BASIC STRUCTURAL CHANGE TO TAKE PLACE IN THE LIVES OF DISADVANTAGED FAMILIES, THE PARENTS MUST BECOME ACTIVELY AND EFFECTIVELY ENGAGED WITH THE ENVIRONMENT. (MH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036332

Proceedings of Head Start Research

Seminar #5:

INTERVENTION IN FAMILY LIFE

Washington, D.C.
January 13, 1969

PS002333

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Educational Testing Service TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

PARENTAL BEHAVIOR AND CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT IMPLICATIONS FOR HEAD START

Head Start Research Seminar #5
Washington, D.C.
January 13, 1969

PREFACE[1]

The intention to involve parents in the operation of the program and to improve the quality of family interaction and of family participation in the institutions of the community were prominent among the original objectives of Project Head Start. These objectives are difficult to achieve and it is not surprising that the programmatic and instructional aspects of the Head Start classrooms reflect more progress than do the features of the program designed to have a positive impact on parents. Yet involvement of parents in the schools, whether through community based "parent power" organizations or individual contacts between parent and school, represents one of the most significant developments in the urban educational arena; and the extent to which we can understand and work with the emerging community forces may, in some locations at least, profoundly affect the future course of early education in Head Start and other settings.

This seminar was organized in order to offer an opportunity to discuss some of the issues and processes which relate family to school achievement and both to the structure of the society, and to consider the promises and problems of intervention in family life by a federal program.

This initial paper will attempt to cover these points:

1. To summarize the available empirical research on effects of parental behavior and values upon cognitive development and school achievement in young children;

2. To review evidence for social class and ethnic differences in the dimensions of parental behavior shown by research to be most relevant for these aspects of child development;

3. To sketch some of the conceptions of linkage between social and cultural features of society and educational achievement and cognitive activity in children;

4. To raise some questions about the implications of these linkages for intervention by Head Start and other federal programs in the lives of lower class families.

---

[1] This paper was presented at the fifth Head Start Research Seminar, held in Washington, D.C. on January 13, 1969.

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to Judith Evans for her painstaking, thoughtful help in preparing this material, and to Audra Adelberger for her cheerful editorial assistance.

The two succeeding papers will respond to these in part directly and in part by offering alternative points of view on some of the issues and questions raised.

PART I

Family Characteristics and School Achievement in Young Children

In the past, the parts played by family and school in the young child's life have been more complementary than competitive. Although there is a great deal of overlap and sharing, families have had primary responsibility for those aspects of child-rearing that include moral development, social responsibility and skills, emotional growth and stability, and other behavior loosely referred to as "personality." The school has been assigned responsibility for cognitive and academic training and development.

This traditional division of labor is now being reexamined, chiefly as a result of concern over the poor school performance of children from urban ghettos. Do children from low-income minority homes sustain educational disadvantage because of the inadequacy of the school, or do they bring cognitive and educational deficits to the school from their homes? To what extent is low academic performance rooted in community and family experiences that affect educability? At another level of social significancy, what is the long-term responsibility of society for conditions that make for the alleged educational damage to the preschool child and for the customary gap between the ghetto family and the ghetto school in understanding, communication and culture?

The concept of the family as a socializer of cognitive behavior seems likely to become one of the most thoroughly explored areas of early education in the next few years. It is a concept of particular significance to programs of intervention designed to work with families as part of a coordinated intervention program.

The purpose of this seminar is, first, to bring together and comment on the work of scholars who are trying in various ways to enlarge our understanding of the role of the family in the educational process. Second, it is to consider how programs of intervention may cooperate with the family in the most productive ways possible.

Parental Variables

It may be useful to begin with a summary of some of the work already done in this field. What are the attitudes, values, and exchanges of behavior between family members and young children that promote cognitive growth, scholastic achievement, and educability--that is, the readiness to learn in an educational setting?

The answer to this question is obscured by a number of serious methodological and statistical problems. For example, investigators of maternal behavior have a creative streak and a flair for originality. Rarely will they use a concept, a variable, a technique for gathering data, or a research population exactly as did another investigator. Nuances, variations and revisions abound; in effect, each of these studies is a single, independent study. Since unreplicated results are only slightly better than no results at all, the research landscape, in my view, tends toward clutter rather than clarity. Describing it coherently is a task that seems to call more for literary artistry than for scholarship.

A listing of studies showing some correlation between maternal, paternal or family characteristics which might be thought to be causal in some reasonable way appears in Figure I[2]. Some of the parental attitudes and behaviors clearly overlap, suggesting that they might be grouped into a smaller number of categories without undue distortion. Others might group them in quite different ways, but here is the way they look to me:

A. Intellectual Relationship

1. Demand for high achievement

   Consistent through several studies is a positive relationship between high need achievement and academic performance of their children and the tendency of parents: a) to value intellectual achievement in their children (Moss & Kagan, 1958; Crandall et al., 1960; Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964; Honzik, 1967), b) to set high standards for their children (Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Rau et al., 1964), c) to reward high achievement as well as punish poor achievement (Kagan & Freeman, 1963; Bing, 1963; Crandall et al., 1964; Katkovsky et al., 1964).

2. Maximization of verbal interaction

   A child's opportunities to participate in conversation and activities with adults at home (Milner, 1951; Bing, 1963; Slaughter, 1968), and his parents' tendency to provide situations that will enlarge the child's vocabulary (Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964) are related to the child's verbal and academic achievement.

---

[2] Figure I is a summary tabulation of studies on parent-child (especially mother-child) interaction. It includes investigator's names and dates of studies, age group studied, set of subjects, race or ethnic affiliates of subjects, a list of child variables investigated, and a list of variables found to correlate significantly with the child variables.

3. Engagement with and attentiveness to the child

   In the studies cited, parental interest in and involvement with the child correlated with academic achievement (Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Witkin, et al., 1962). Indications of a parent's involvement with his child include awareness of how the child is doing in school (Mannino, 1962; Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964), interest in the child's activities (Bayley & Schaefer, 1964; Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959), and providing assistance on school and non-school tasks (Bing, 1963; Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964).

4. Maternal teaching behavior

   A series of studies have looked specifically at the interaction that occurs when a mother teaches her child a task. Some of the maternal strategies that facilitate the child's learning of a task include giving the child specific directions and feedback, working to elicit the child's cooperation, accompanying requests for physical response with verbal explanations, and using elaborated rather than restricted language styles (Busse, 1967; Olim, Hess & Shipman, 1967; Hess & Shipman, 1965-1969).

5. Diffuse intellectual stimulation

   Children who score high on achievement tests and show high need achievement come from homes where parents are interested in stimulating the child intellectually. This stimulation is provided when books and materials to explore and manipulate are available (Milner, 1951; Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Bing, 1963), when curiosity is aroused (Witkin, et al., 1962), when learning situations are created in the home (Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964), and when the child is read to by personally important adults (Milner, 1951).

B. Affective Relationship

1. Warm affective relationship with child

   Children who are high achievers tend to have parents who treat them warmly (Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945; Witkin, et al., 1962), and provide them with emotional support (Baldwin et al., 1945), and to come from homes where there are more affective acts (Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959), and more opportunities for positive interaction with adults (Milner, 1951). A close relationship with a parent affects the child in different ways depending on the sex of the parent and the age and sex of the child (Bayley & Schaefer, 1964; Honzik, 1967; Busse, 1967).

2. Feelings of high regard for child and self

   A parent's acceptance of himself (Busse, 1967; Slaughter, 1968; Hess & Shipman, 1965-1969) and his high regard for his child's competence (Winterbottom, 1958; Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Crandall et al., 1964) are related positively to the child's performance. A child's perception of whether his parents accept him is a better predictor of the child's performance than his parents' statements about their acceptance of him (Barwick & Arbuckle, 1962).

C. Interaction Patterns

1. Pressure for independence and self-reliance

   The relation between achievement in children and the degree of independence that parents encourage appears to depend on the age of the child and the task he is performing. Studies have been done at two age levels, early childhood (ages 1-5) and late childhood (ages 9-13), with different results. In general, studies with the younger age group indicate that high achievers are less dependent than low achievers on adults (Crandall, et al., 1960). They have mothers who grant their children autonomy (Bayley & Schaefer, 1964) and make positive demands for self-sufficiency and independence (Busse, 1967). On the other hand, studies with older children indicate that high achievers have mothers who were restrictive with the child when he was young and encourage more independence when the child is about ten (Winterbottom, 1958; Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Chance, 1961; Witkin, et al., 1962; Shaw, 1964; Busse, 1967).

2. Clarity and severity of disciplinary rules
   High achievers tend to come from homes where specific limits are set for the child, limits the child is aware of and expected to comply with (Drews & Teahan, 1957). Mothers of these high achievers have been described as demanding, controlling and restrictive (Milner, 1951; Kent & Davis, 1957; Drews & Teahan, 1957; Winterbottom, 1958; Bing, 1963).
3. Use of conceptual rather than arbitrary regulatory strategies
   Studies that concern the type rather than severity of regulation indicate that mothers who accompany regulation with explanations (Rau, et al., 1964) and justification of discipline (Kagan & Freeman, 1963), and who control their children by means of cognitive-rational or personal-subjective rather than imperative-normative techniques (Hess & Shipman, 1965-1969) have children who are high achievers.

These parental and family characteristics have various implications for programs of intervention. Some suggest specific things that one can teach the mother to do with her child or to teach her child. Some reveal attitudes and general orientations that structure the relationship and influence the interaction between parents and children. They seem to have in common a base of parental concern. This type of concern, however, may not be sufficient if one is dealing with a disadvantaged population in which there is a low level of formal schooling, an inadequate store of information, little school-relevant experience, discrimination, fatigue, poverty and other factors that may make if difficult for a mother to do an adequate task of preparing her child for school, even when she holds a deep and intense interest in his future and high aspirations for his achievements.

I would like to illustrate and amplify this summary of research by presenting some data from our recent study of maternal cognitive environments and maternal teaching styles of Negro mothers in Chicago[3] and from a follow-up study of the children's performance during their first two years of school[4]. Some of the correlations between maternal behavior when the children were four years of age and the children's school performance two to four years later may help summarize our results.

---

[3] This research was supported by Research Grant #R34 from the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, by the Ford Foundation Fund for the Advancement of Learning, and grants-in-aid from the Social Science Research Committee of the Division of Social Sciences, University of Chicago, by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Division of Research, Project Head Start, and from the U.S. Office of Education. My colleagues on this project are Dr. Virginia Shipman, Dr. Roberta Bear and Dr. Jere Brophy.

We used four groups of Negro mothers and their children, drawn from families with four different socioeconomic backgrounds: a) professional, executive, middle class occupational backgrounds; b) skilled work backgrounds; c) unskilled and semi-skilled backgrounds; and d) ADC families without fathers in the home. We interviewed the mothers at home and at the University, obtained responses on standard tests from both mother and child, and asked each mother to teach several tasks to her child. The variables listed in Table I are drawn from these observational, testing and interview sessions, and the correlations given in the table apply to the total group of roughly 160 children and mothers, including those from the middle class. Data for the three working class groups alone follows a similar profile, although the magnitude of correlations tends to be lower (possibly because of restriction of range).

---

[4] Hess, Robert D., Virginia Shipman, Jere Edward Brophy, and Roberta Meyer Bear. The Cognitive Environments of Urban Preschool Children. University of Chicago: School of Education. December 1968. Address inquiries to: Dr. R. D. Hess, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 94305; or to: E.R.I.C. Clearninghouse on Early Childhood Education, 805 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Urbana, Illinois, 61801.

Hess, Robert D., Virginia Shipman, Jere Edward Brophy, and Roberta Meyer Bear (in collaboration with Audra B. Adelberger). The Cognitive Environments of Urban Preschool Children: Follow-up Phase. To be published in 1969. Address inquiries to: Dr. R. D. Hess at above address.

TABLE 1

PRESCHOOL MATERNAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC MEASURES RELATED TO THE CHILD'S SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
(Total Group)

Maternal Measures	Standardized Tests		Teacher's Evaluations (grades)		
	Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test:Total	Lee-Clark Reading Achievement Test:Primer	Two-year totals		
			Reading	Arithmetic	Conduct
Home and Community Environment					
Rooms per Person	.24	.32	.17	.24	.31
Availability and Use of Home Resources	.35	.50	.33	.42	.44
Attitudes toward Non-family World					
Out-of-Home Activities	.34	.38	.32	.32	.23
"Powerlessness"	-.27	-.32	-.22	-.31	-.21
Personal Optimism	.28	.24	16	.23	.18
Control Strategies					
First Day: % Imperative	-.22	-.28	-.22	-.25	-.34
Mastery: % Status-Normative	-.20	-.37	-.27	-.29	-.30
Mastery: % Personal-Subjective	.22	.38	.28	.28	.28
Teaching Behaviors					
Etch-a-Sketch					
Number of Models Mother Shows Child	.27	.32	.26	.33	.26
Number of Specific Turning Directions	.27	.33	.26	.27	.18

(Continued)

TABLE I (Continued)

Maternal Measures	Standardized Tests		Teacher's Evaluations (grades)		
	Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test:Total	Lee-Clark Reading Achievement Test:Primer	Two-year totals		
			Reading	Arithmetic	Conduct
Teaching Behaviors (Continued)					
Block-sorting Task					
Orientation	.28	.27	.30	.29	.21
Praise and Engagement	.26	.32	.21	.20	.25
Specificity of Maternal Feedback	.18	.33	.27	.32	.23
Requests for Block Placement	-.39	-.36	-.34	-.39	-.25
Use of Standard English					
Language Factor Score	.24	.35	.27	.34	.35
Affectionateness					
Support toward Child (Interviewer's Rating)	.29	.45	.27	.37	.24
Warmth in Block-sorting Task	.18	.18	.08*	.13*	.09*
Affectionateness in Teaching Tasks	.29	.29	.21	.23	.12*

---

*not significant ($p > .05$)

Under Home and Community Environment, Rooms per Person is an index of crowding, indicated by the ratio of rooms to people in the home. Availability and Use of Home Resources is a factor score derived from a number of variables reflecting the mother's use of resources in the home: the use and maintenance of physical space, the restrictions placed on the child's out-of-home movements, the physical appearance and care of the home, the child's play equipment and opportunities, the child's involvement in self-help skills and homework routines.

The second heading, Attitudes toward Non-family World, concerns the mother's view of herself and her relation to the institutions and opportunities of her community. Out-of-Home Activities were measured by the number of community groups in which the mother participated (church group, PTA, union, social club, etc.). "Powerlessness" is a factor score obtained from an educational attitudes survey including items like the following: "If I disagree with the principal, there is very little I can do." Personal Optimism was rated on the basis of an interview question about the opportunities in the mother's life: "If things continue as they are now, do you think you will have 1) many opportunities to improve your life, 2) some, 3) few, 4) none?"

The control strategies that the mother used to guide her child's behavior were identified by type, not degree of control. We asked the mothers what they would say before sending their children off to school for the first time and what they would do if their children misbehaved. Their responses showed three types of control strategies that were found to relate significantly to the children's performance. The first was the mother's Use of Imperatives, that is, the percent of the mother's total message which were unqualified commands. Another measure of this type of strategy was called Status-Normative Appeals: the percent of the mother's message units commanding unquestioned obedience to social norms, to institutionalized rules, and to authority figures. The second was Personal-Subjective Appeals: the percent of the mother's message units in which she took account of the child's unique personal attributes, his feelings, wishes, and motivations and urged him to see situations from someone else's perspective. The third approach was Cognitive-Maternal, based on arguments or explanations describing the likely consequences of the child's action.

Table I also reports a group of teaching behaviors found most effective in differentiating effective from ineffective teaching. These measures were obtained from two mother-child interaction tasks. In the Etch-a-Sketch task, mother and child were asked to cooperate in copying geometric patterns onto a screen by manipulating two knobs on an Etch-a-Sketch toy. In the block-sorting task, mothers taught their children to sort blocks by mark and height. The Number of Models Shown Child and Number of Specific Turning Directions were counted while the mother explained the Etch-a-Sketch task to the child. On the block-sorting task, Orientation is a factor score measuring the mother's specificity as she explains the task; Praise and Engagement is a factor score measuring the mother's ability to elicit the child's interest and cooperation during all phases of the teaching tasks. Specificity of Maternal Feedback is a factor score derived from measures of the percent of the time that the mother responded to the child's successful or unsuccessful placements with specific verbalization of labels and focusing. Requests for Block Placement is a measure of the percent of the mother's message units in which she asks or tells the child to place a block, without specific explanation of which one and why.

The mother's use of standard English is represented by the Language Factor Score. This score indicates the complexity of the mother's language and her facility in the use of standard English. It does not indicate her competence in the use of non-standard dialects but is relevant because measures of school performance are typically based upon use of standard English.

Maternal warmth, the last group of variables, was included so that we could compare the effects of cognitive and affective behavior. Support toward Child was based on the home interviewer's rating; Warmth in Block-sorting Task was judged by an observer from the mother's overt behavior during the task; Affectionateness in Teaching Task is a factor score combining eight ratings of maternal warmth in various mother-child interactions.

A number of maternal variables from the preschool study were found significantly related to the child's performance in school as measured by standardized tests and as evaluated by the teacher. Thus it seems justified to argue (with the usual reservations) both for their persistence as maternal behaviors and for their importance in the child's cognitive development. The mother's use of home resources was found significantly and in most cases highly associated (r = .33-.50) with school performance. Maternal attitudes toward the non-family world--participation in out-of-home activities, feelings of effectiveness and optimism--were less strongly but still significantly related to school performance, although the correlations with conduct grades were lower than expected. Maternal control strategies, on the other hand, seemed at least as strongly associated with conduct as with academic grades and standardized test scores. The child who did well in school was likely to have a mother who stressed personal-subjective control strategies and avoided the use of either imperative or status-normative control strategies.

Children who received high academic grades and high objective test scores were also likely to have mothers who showed effective teaching styles in the preschool study. Their mothers tended to be specific in giving directions and feedback, to orient the child to the task, to elicit cooperation and give praise, and to avoid demanding physical actions without accompanying the demands with rationales. The mother's use of facile and complex standard English was found to affect the child's success on school measures to approximately the same degree as the other variables from the maternal cognitive environment. And finally, measures of maternal affective behavior, especially maternal support as rated by home interviewers, were associated with the children's grades and scores. Here again, however, as was the case with mother's attitudes toward the non-family world, correlation with conduct grades was lower than expected. One might predict that active, optimistic, warm mothers would tend to have self-confident children whose classroom behavior would be perceived as "good conduct" relatively independent of academic achievement; unfortunately the data permitted only limited claims for this sequence of maternal attitudes, children's behaviors, and teacher's perceptions. The child of the active, optimistic, and warm mother was as likely to receive good grades in reading and arithmetic as he was to receive good grades in conduct.

The data were also analyzed for sex differences. Girls' school performance, and especially the teacher's rating of their conduct, seemed more affected by maternal behavior than did boys' school performance. Almost all maternal measures except affective behavior were significantly related to girls' conduct grades; for boys, however, only imperative control strategies and use of home resources showed a consistent significant relationship to conduct grades. Mothers who used imperative strategies had sons who tended to get low conduct grades; mothers who availed themselves of a wide range of home resources had sons who tended to get good conduct grades.

When academic grades and objective tests were correlated with maternal variables, sex differences were less consistent than they were with conduct grades, but it remained true that maternal environment was generally more influential on girls than on boys. The major exception was in correlations of maternal control strategies with academic grades and standardized tests. Status-normative and personal-subjective control strategies, when related to academic grades, showed higher correlations for boys than for girls. The imperative control strategy was more highly related to boys' performances on all school performance measures than to girls' school performance. There was also a suggestion that maternal warmth in interaction influences boys more than girls.

This brief excerpt of data from our study helps show why I believe many more studies of the family environment must be made if we are to prepare effective intervention programs. For example, teaching behavior and control strategies need further study to see if it is possible to teach them to mothers, and if so, by what techniques can they most effectively be taught. This is a basic empirical and theoretical question. It is argued in this paper that the mother's behavior in relation to her child is shaped in great part by the influence of the economic, social and cultural community in which she lives and by her position of power and prestige in that community. If this is so, there may be limits to her ability to change her child-rearing behavior without a suitable change in her prestige and status in the community. One of the most significant areas for research and thought is the possible impact of family intervention upon the social and cultural system in which the family exists because it is this system that fosters and tolerates learning environment (including the ghetto school) that is destructive in many ways both to individual families and to the vigor of the nation as a whole.

Socioeconomic Status

From the foregoing discussion, it appears that several family (largely maternal) patterns of behavior do affect the cognitive growth and academic performance of young children. The purpose of this section is to summarize the evidence suggesting a disparity (or lack of disparity) in these parental behaviors at different socioeconomic levels. Since many of the empirical data are skimpy, taken from non-randomly selected research groups, and described in terms of variables not entirely captured by the categories listed above, this summary should be regarded as interpretative rather than as evidence accumulated to test a hypothesis.

A. Intellectual relationship

Some clear social class and ethnic differences have been found on the intellectual relationship between parents and children. For example, a variety of experiments have suggested that middle-class parents tend to reinforce achievement and criticize failure in more consistent and effective ways (Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959; Winterbottom, 1958; Shaw, 1964) than working-class parents do.

There are also social class differences in parental aspirations and expectations of achievement. While working-class parents have high aspirations for their children, they are not as high as those of middle-class parents; working-class parents are also much less likely to expect that the child will achieve at the level of their aspirations (Kahl, 1953; Hyman, 1953; Hess & Shipmen, 1965). Perhaps the significant element is one suggested by Hylan Lewis (1961) in his study of poor families: parents want a good education for their children but lack knowledge about how to get it. Because of experiences with schools in the past, their expectations are lower than their aspirations.

Although it is generally assumed that there are large social-class differences in the amount of verbal stimulation afforded children by their mothers, the empirical base for this assumption is not firm. Although differences appear in laboratory or interview studies (e.g., Hess & Shipman, 1965; Hess et al., 1968), recent studies of lower-class speech patterns (Labov, 1968) show that lower-class families are highly verbal and use complex speech patterns. Perhaps the most significant class differences are related to the pattern and mode of linguistic exchange (Bernstein, 1961; Lawton, 1963, 1964; Loban, 1963) rather than to the amount of speech.

There is little reason, however, to question the studies which indicate that middle-class parents provide much more reading material and read to their children more frequently than lower-class persons, but this finding may not apply to speech.

Perhaps the significant element about the verbal exchange of middle-class parents is the sequencing or "meshing" (comments by one family member relating to comments or events that preceded it) in their patterns of communication (Bee, 1967). This is consistent with the SES differences in India, Puerto Rico, and the United States in exchange of ideas in family communication (Strauss, 1968). The less industrialized and urbanized the society, the greater were the SES differences observed.

In this country, the amount of exposure to standard English in the home is probably not a strong factor, or the impact of television on the speech and thought of preschool children from working-class homes would be more apparent since TV viewing varies little by SES (Schramm, Lyle & Parker, 1961). A concept of linkage between the speech of mother and child is needed to account for the differential effects of verbal exposure of middle- and lower-class children. Perhaps there are contingencies established by consistency and timing of verbal reinforcement to the child's specific behavior that are relevant to the child's verbal achievement.

B. Interpersonal affective relationship

It has frequently been found that middle-class mothers are more accepting of children's behavior and more permissive in regulating this behavior (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). In addition, evidence has accumulated supporting the notion that parents' self-esteem and esteem for others are related both to social class and to children's behavior (Bradshaw, 1968; NIHD, 1968; Hess, 1968). It should be noted, however, that the definition of social class varies from study to study. When race and ethnicity are not included and when a certain minimum level of status and subsistence is passed, occupation, education, and finances seem to play a lesser role in esteem than is generally assumed (Rosenberg, 1965; Coopersmith, 1967). Nevertheless, significant social class differences have been found in our study dealing entirely with Negro families: middle-class mothers reported more optimism about the future and more confidence in their ability to deal with the school than did working-class mothers; there was also a difference between ADC families and other working-class families (Hess et al., 1968).

A few studies deal directly with the mother's attention to the child, and a number of others provide relevant information indirectly. When Kamii and Radin (1967) observed Negro mothers with their preschool children, they found working-class mothers less likely to respond to the expressed needs of their children or to attempts by the child to get their attention. In our study of maternal socialization of cognitive behavior, mothers from working-class backgrounds were much less likely to anticipate their children's needs while teaching them or to see things from the standpoint of the child in hypothetical situations where the child was presumably at fault. In a study by Zunich (1962) middle- and lower-class mothers were observed through one-way mirrors during unstructured interaction with their children. Middle-class mothers were likely to make contact with the child more often and to do more directing, helping, interfering by structuring, attentive observing, and playing with the child. Lower-class mothers were high on remaining out of contact.

A generally congruent picture of lower-class family life is described by Hylan Lewis (1961) in his study of poor families in Washington, D.C. Unguided and unplanned occurrences outside the family affect the child at a much earlier age in low-income families; apparently because parents become baffled by the child and leave him to his own devices. Lower-class parents may have a more difficult time trying to understand their children and are less likely to anticipate, plan and attend to the child's behavior in ways that make his social and physical environment relatively predictable and secure.

C. Interaction patterns

Many studies of parent-child interaction deal in one way or another with maternal behavior directed toward restricting, changing, and discouraging behavior in the child. This type of interaction has been labeled "democratic-authoritarian" in the Fels work, "permissive vs. restrictive" by others, and a disciplinary issue by others. From the data summarized by Bronfenbrenner in his classic review (1958), middle-class mothers are more responsive to inner states and have a more "democratic," more accepting relationship with their children; lower-class mothers are more concerned with external standards of conduct and adherence to norms of the community. Similar findings are reported by Kohn and his colleagues (1959a, 1959b, 1960).

Class differences in the use of authority in direct dealing with children are consistent with this general picture. Hoffman (1960), in describing influence techniques employed by parents, discusses a category he calls unqualified power assertion (direct threats, deprivations, physical force). This technique is used more frequently by lower-class parents than by parents from the middle class. These reported behaviors are congruent with attitudes expressed on the PARI, a parent attitude instrument devised by Schaefer and Bell (1958). One of the two major factors of the PARI is an "authoritarian control" ("approval of maternal control of the child") factor. Responses showing approval of control are negatively related, in various studies, to occupation of father and education of mother (Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker & Quay, 1959; Zuckerman, Barrett & Bragiel, 1960) and to measures of social class (Garfield & Helper, 1962). Within social class, level of education correlates negatively with the scores on the control factor (Becker & Krug, 1965; Marshall, 1961). Other studies have shown that mothers from lower-class backgrounds see their children as needing more control than do mothers of middle-class origin (Gildea, Glidewell, & Kantor, 1961).

In our work in Chicago we identified three strategies of maternal control: imperative or status-normative (commands based on norms of the groups or community and position within a family system); subjective-personal (based on consideration of one's own inner states and those of others); and cognitive-rational (based on explanation of the future consequences of a given act or pattern of behavior) (Hess et al., 1968). Mothers from working-class backgrounds tend to use proportionately more imperative and status-normative statements in describing their interaction with their children. Observations of mothers in the home in interaction with infants (Bradshaw, 1968) also show that lower-class mothers rarely use explanation when punishing their children.

Most of the variables discussed so far describe the behavior and attitudes of the parent and the situations where these are imparted to the child, and in that case they reflect parental teaching. More and more researchers, however, are showing an interest in situations in which the mother consciously or directly plays the role of a teacher. Some of these studies report social class differences. In 1967, for example, Kamii and Radin reported tentative evidence that middle-class Negro mothers reward their children more often for desirable behavior and are less likely to give orders without explanation than lower-class Negro mothers. Slaughter (1968) reports that the extent of direct communication between mother and child during interaction influences academic achievement and tends to show social class differences.

Our investigation of structured interactions (Hess et al., 1968) suggests that middle-class mothers are more likely to provide the child with an orientation to the task, to request a verbal response rather than (or along with) physical compliance, to be specific in their instructions, to use motivation techniques that involve explicit or implicit reward, and, in general, to provide the child with information he needs to complete the task and to monitor his performance.

PART II

Links between the Society and Individual Behavior

Underlying the different approaches to parental behavior and children's school performance are several implicit assumptions about the relation between society and individual behavior. They are suggested in these questions: What are the conditions of the child's external social and cultural world? What are the adaptive consequences for the adults and children who live under those conditions? What specific forms do adult orientations to the environment take when adults interact with children? What are the behavioral outcomes for the children? This sequence of questions assumes a linkage between the society - its institutions and the conditions of life it offers - and the behavior of adults, who then act as socializing and teaching agents for their children. The questions also assume that there are both direct and unintenionally mediated linkages between the environment and children's behavior.

Children interact with the environment directly at times absorbing information about the norms and values of the social system and developing a pattern of response to it. In some of our own studies, for example, mothers in slum areas have reported that their young children are fearful of fire, rodents, dark areas, attack by someone stronger, etc. At an older age the child in the slum community acquires information about society and his own place in it as he becomes aware of the rewards and achievements available to others. To the degree that this type of experience conveys a view of the society and its contemporary inequalities and differences, it transmits norms of the system. Thus it is part of the process of socialization even when no socializing agent is intentionally involved at the points of interaction.

It is not clear whether the behavioral outcomes of direct contact are different from those mediated through parents and other agents. Studies of parent-child similarity show that parental attitudes and values can account for only part of children's behavior in many areas and in others, for very little at all (Jennings & Neimi, in press; Reiss, 1965). But because little research has been done on behavioral outcomes of direct contact vs. behavioral outcomes of mediated contact, current studies of deprivation tend to treat the two as similar. Thus no distinction between the two can be made here. However, it does seem we have underestimated the extent to which direct (though diffuse) experience with the environment, through interaction with peers, TV, newspapers, popular music, observation of life in the community, awareness of social and economic inequality, and other points of contact, directly shapes the child's cognitive and behavioral strategies and resources.[5]

---

[5] It should be noted in passing that the concern of this discussion is the mechanisms of exchange between the environment and the child, not the relative effects of genetic and environmental sources of influence. This interest in the specific processes of the ecology of human learning rather than the relative impact of experience and genetic contribution reflects contemporary pursuits in socialization research.

This is not to say that socialization theory rules out the possibility that some social class differences may be associated with genetic substructure. A number of scientists have emphasized this possibility recently and have called for more research to evaluate the relative contributions of genetic and non-genetic factors in the development of human behavior. A recent statement by the Academy of Sciences in response to these calls for new research takes the position that the complexity of the problem makes it extremely unlikely that research would produce useful information (Science, Vol. 158, No. 3803, Nov. 1967).

In a discussion of Head Start, a consideration of the linkages between social structure and individual behavior necessarily deals with the impact of disadvantaged environments upon individual behavior of young children. The literature dealing with issues of "compensatory education" contains many descriptions and assumptions about the ways in which black ghetto and other low socioeconomic conditions affect the cognitive and school behavior of young children. These issues are discussed in this section by sketching a view of the lower class urban Negro's environment, the effects of this environment upon his behavior and then, by drawing upon recent writings, outlining a number of implicit models of deprivation and its presumed impact upon individual cognitive behavior.

Features of Disadvantaged Environments

An individual's position in the socioeconomic hierarchy of a society is related to a great many of his characteristics and behaviors. This discussion will focus upon those that seem most relevant to educational achievement. Economic resources are not directly considered; their role is assumed as basic to many other areas of behavior.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the social structure is the degree of power it awards an individual to control his own life, to implement his plans, to protect his resources, his family, and himself. It is in this area that urban lower-working class Negro adults are the most disadvantaged. They are subject to exploitation, have difficulty defending the privacy of their homes against invasion, by welfare agencies, for example (Cloward & Piven, 1967), and are more likely to be arrested and detained without justification. In addition, they tend to be diagnosed in mental health clinics as more maladjusted and have poorer prognoses than middle-class patients with similar records (Haase, 1956; Riessman, 1964), and they are given less adequate treatment in hospital emergency wards (Sudnow, 1957).

A lack of power and economic resources makes the urban working-class Negro vulnerable to disaster. The routes through which misfortune may strike are numerous. Urban Negroes are those most likely to be unemployed with little warning, to be victimized by bureaucratic or legislative delay, and to be without financial reserve, either their own or from ready outside sources (Cloward & Elman, 1966).

Urban working-class adults, especially Negroes, command relatively little prestige or esteem and are subjected to discrimination of varying degrees. This finds expression in occupational experiences that differ in essential ways from those of middle-class adults. For example, semi-skilled or unskilled workers are given little or no part in the policy- or decision-making process; they carry out the decisions of others. This difference in occupational roles may be an inherent and virtually unmodifiable characteristic of a complex industrialized system (Kohn, 1963; Inkeles, 1960).

Lack of money, power, education, and prestige restricts the working-class person's available alternatives for action. He is caught in a cycle in which social reality and physical immobility reduce his options concerning place of residence, education, employment and action in other arenas.

Another feature of the social structure is the relatively small overlap between the experience of lower- and middle-class adults. The lower-class adult is more often exposed to a lower-class way of life, especially that of the urban Negro. The domestic worker, for example, becomes acquainted with intimacies of middle-class life, but the employer is unlikely to know anything of what the servant considers her real life. Television also conveys middle-class attitudes and dreams; the lower-class adult may not learn much from TV about the middle class, but the middle-class white learns even less--a great deal less--about the urban Negro. This lack of mutual experience and understanding contributes much to discrimination and social alienation.

The Effects of the Environment upon Adults

The impact of environmental circumstances is to encourage and foster a number of adaptive responses in the adults of the community. The reports are by no means uniform, of course there is great variation in the patterns that individuals develop and express. For purposes of brevity, however, this discussion is concerned with general trends and tendencies that apply in different ways to different individuals.

Working class adults tend to perceive and structure social relationships in terms of power. This tendency may underlie the greater incidence of physical punishment in lower-class families (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). An orientation to power would seem to follow from the lower-class person's position in society. He himself has little voice in decisions affecting his daily life, while those who have status and authority also have power. In line with this orientation, the lower-class father tends to equate his children's respect with their compliance with his wishes and commands (Cohen & Hodges, 1963;

Kohn, 1959). The middle classes have recently been made strongly aware that the urban working-class Negro feels both an orientation to power and a lack of power in the broader community.

A cluster of attitudes expressing *low esteem, a sense of inefficacy, and passivity* are, perhaps, not so much stable lower-class personality traits as they are responses to frustrations and unpredictability. Contingencies linking action to outcome are frequently missing or intermittent in the ghetto. One adaptation to this is to elect short term goals, seek more immediately predictable gratification (Davis, 1948), or resist and occasionally use illicit means to achieve usually unavailable rewards (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960).

Another consequence of lower-class life circumstances is to encourage a *simplification of the experiential world and a restriction of the range of linguistic modes of verbal exchange* (Bernstein, 1961, 1964). This follows in part from the interlacing of language and behavior and from the limited behavioral alternatives in the lives of lower-class persons. It does not imply that they speak less often or less effectively, but that the patterning of their speech differs according to the nature of their interaction (Schatzman & Strauss, 1955).

Another adaptive consequence of lower-class life is an unusual degree of *reliance upon non-work-related friendships and kinship contacts* for social support. Institutions are not seen as sources of support, and the world of social contacts is divided into friends and strangers. From strangers a lower-class adult has no reason to expect fair or helpful treatment; friends are salient.

Similarly, the lower-class adult tends to mistrust the unfamiliar and, as a corollary, reject intellectuality. He feels unable to compete in unfamiliar modes of reasoning and is reluctant to accept standards of evaluation that would find him inadequate. In addition, the circumstances of his life (at work, for example) orient him toward practical action rather than toward speculation and evaluation.

The relative isolation of the lower-class person from middle-class experience helps limit his skill in getting and judging information that might affect his life. His ignorance makes him susceptible to exploitation by individuals and agencies both within and outside his own community.

Finally, the lower-class person is likely to respond to his circumstances with anger and resentment. Aware of his lack of power, exploitation, low esteem, and limited opportunities, he often feels deep rage (Grier & Cobb, 1968). Whether his anger is turned upon himself, thus further limiting his effectiveness in the larger community, or turned outward toward the immediate community and ultimately against society as a whole, it remains a central consideration in the urban Negro's life.

What I have said so far suggests the context within which models of deprivation are to be understood. First, the child's behavior must be seen as the outcome of both direct and mediated contacts with his physical, social, and cultural environment. Second, it must be recognized that working-class adults mediate between the environment and children's behavior, and that these adults are themselves shaped by the environment in characteristic ways. Their adaptive responses to circumstances of lower-class life will surely be reflected in their behavior as mediating agents.

We are accustomed to thinking of the school as a mediating agent; what I wish to stress here is that the family is also a powerful mediator. As a result, no model can be adequate and no intervention program can be effective unless the family's influence upon the child's cognitive behavior is accurately understood.

Implicit Models of "Deprivation"[6]

1. The family is damaging. The first approach, or implicit model, stresses the presumed damaging effects of the family on the child's potential development. The family is seen as hindering rather than helping the child's growth. Because of the child's traumatic, esteem-lowering experiences within the home he passes a "critical learning period" on some tasks, and later education cannot overcome this deficiency. In other words, the effects of experience may be irreversible, permanently damaging the child's emotional and intellectual capabilities.

Those who believe that the family is detrimental to the child's growth and development argue in consequence that intervention, to be effective, should take place during the child's first few months or years of life. Proponents of this model are likely also to urge that in some instances the child should be removed from the family.

---

[6] Strictly speaking, these are patterns of assumptions rather than models.

2. Cultural disparity: family and school in conflict. A second approach stresses cultural disparity. In this implicit model the family and school are seen to conflict as the result of ethnic and social class differences. Problems occur for the child when the teacher lacks knowledge of and respect for the ethnic culture that his pupils represent, and when the curriculum, designed primarily for middle-class white children, fails to take into account the cultural milieu within which the child must learn to operate.

Cultural disparity models emphasize differences in the structural features of the subculture and the larger sociocultural system. These models most often take three forms:

a) Deprivation is seen as the outcome of cultural pluralism.

It is argued that ethnic differences and self-imposed or involuntary segregation of ethnic groups into enclaves or ghettos induce disadvantages of various kinds. Ethnic dialects and languages have lower prestige in the community than does standard English (Lambert & Teguchi, 1956); occupational and educational opportunities are likely to be restricted not only by discrimination but by lack of information and contact with other segments of the society. The nature of the deprivation, however, is not so much in absolute level of capability and achievement as in the differential evaluation of ethnic characteristics by the dominant society and by other relevant ethnic groups.

b) Disadvantage is viewed as the learning of behavior not rewarded by middle-class society.

Here it is argued that children in disadvantaged areas in the society, especially in slum communities, learn behavior that is appropriate and useful for their home environment but not useful for subsequent experiences in the school, not rewarded, and therefore not successful. The emphasis of this point of view is not on the child's inability to learn but on the lack of congruence between the behavior he had learned and the behavior valued by the middle-class, school-oriented society.

c) Disadvantage is due to the inadequacy of social institutions.

This form of the cultural disparity model is related to the preceding type in which disadvantage is seen as learning not rewarded by middle-class society. It differs in stressing the defects of social institutions. The lower-class person does not bear sole responsibility for his disadvantage; the blame falls as much on the institutions of middle-class society. Institutional representatives in the school, the police force, and other parts of the social structure fail to understand the lower-class child or adult, to be sympathetic with his problems, to be able to communicate with him, and in other ways to permit him to learn about and relate to the central components of society. The children of poor households may have poor learning patterns, little practice in abstraction, and poor discipline, but it is also true that teachers often are ignorant of the children's needs, have distorted perceptions of the abilities, and lack the skills to teach them properly.

Regardless of their form, cultural disparity models all acknowledge that the patterns in social subcultures are opposed to the dominant middle-class value system. The school's orientation is toward planning for the future. There is an emphasis on abstract and objective discourse, on learning for its own sake, on respect for the law and private property, civil obedience, religion, and on rules of propriety in sexual and verbal behavior. These values conflict with the social realities of the vernacular culture maintained in "deprived" areas.

It is clear to those who know ghetto areas intimately that "cultural deprivation" and "verbal deprivation" are poor concepts with which to approach educational problems. Encountered on their own ground, ghetto children are not empty vessels waiting to be filled with middle-class culture. They are in contact with a different and opposing culture; in the years from five to fifteen they come to know their own culture more perfectly, the school culture less and less. Many reject the school and its values explicitly. For others, the conflict that interferes with success in school is hidden from view.

Cultural disparity models suggest that intervention should be based on: (1) a recognition of subcultures and an understanding of their contribution to the wider American society, (2) a recognition of the disparity between what is rewarded in the neighborhood and what the school rewards. School achievement and values may be contradictory to what helps the child adjust in his own group, and (3) a recognition of the inadequacies of current social institutions that are based on and adhere to middle-class norms.

3. Deficit models: family and school not in conflict, but family is deficient. A third approach to disadvantage is to view family and school as allies sharing the same goals and values in educating children. The family, however, is seen as

a weak or deficient partner incapable of handling the responsibility for the child's early education. School learning and enrichment programs are necessary to provide additional experiences; the school and the family need to work together to develop the child. Subsumed under this approach are several models of psycho-social deprivation, of which the two most common are the malnutrition model and the underdeveloped resources model.

a) Malnutrition model.

Perhaps the most popular deficit model represents psycho-social deprivation as analogous to malnutrition. The child who is "deprived" has received insufficient quantities of the nutrients needed for proper growth and development. Family resources are not adequate to educate the child; thus he has insufficient information and concepts when he enters school. The family fails to provide: exposure to beneficial stimulation; meaningful interpretations of the experiential world; instruction on coping with contingencies in the environment. The child has not learned at home the concepts he will need at school or the vocabulary required for effective functioning in contemporary society; he has not been exposed to cultural artifacts and experiences of various sorts; his store of information about the world and the way it works is inadequate.

In short, his life is lacking in the kinds of stimulation that are needed to promote effective cognitive and social growth. This point of view presents learning as the acquisition of relevant experiences and relevant knowledge. However, relevant means useful in the middle-class, school-oriented society.

b) Underdeveloped resources model.

Some hold the view that though a child may have learned to operate within his own society, his environment is relatively restricted. The child's behavior, therefore, lacks the complexity needed if the child is to participate fully in other parts of society. In other words, the child's culture may equip the child to function within sub-cultural limits, but the school needs to intervene to develop broader capabilities that have not been encouraged.

4. Social structural model: family mediates environment. This last approach, like the deficit models just described, treat the family as an important partner in education. But instead of stressing how the family is deficient, it emphasizes why these deficiencies exist: it is the structure of society that makes the lower-class family impotent as an educational agent. Although the family has an important role to play in providing the child with a learning framework, the low status and powerlessness of poor families in modern society limit the family's influence. This is the result of factors familiar to all of us. For example, competition for scarce resources helps keep the poor in poverty; the lower-class individual lacks alternatives for action within the society; there is discrimination against ethnic groups and poor people; effort is often not related to reward.

In this context disadvantage is a lack of meaningful pattern in the experiential world. The child's experience does not include an adequate array of patterns, sequences, or associations between events to allow him to develop an understanding of the relationship among elements of the experiential world. He is not accustomed to seeing cause and effect, for example. The stimuli to which a child is exposed are not presented in a context that permit him to use them or generalize them to some future situation or experience. Deprivation, then, is a matter not of the absence of stimuli but of the absence of pattern, association, and sequence in the stimuli, a lack of meaning in the external world and a consequent inability to organize and use the stimuli with which one is familiar.

Another way to express the lack of meaningful patterns in the experiential world of the disadvantaged is to say that the environment lacks contingencies, or systematic, predictable rewards and consequences. In deprived circumstances, for example, socializing agents may not organize the stimulation of the environment to provide effective learning schedules (Gewirtz, 1968; Hess, 1968; Hess & Shipman, 1967). The environment of the disadvantaged child is arranged (primarily by the parents or teacher) in such a way that the desired behavior is not adequately encouraged by reinforcement schedules. According to this view of deprivation, human and environmental resources are not being used in a way that will produce the desired results. Stimulation and direction may, for example, be random. This feature of socialization is, in our view, related to the lack of predictability that parents feel in their own relationship to the society and its rewards.

The social structural model suggests several possible intervention techniques. First, the school should expand the child's knowledge of how to act effectively in the larger society. Second, attempts should be made to get the mother involved in the school's program and to expand her sphere of knowledge and influence, with the expectation that doing so will modify the child's home environment.

Third, intervention programs should foster community organization and involvement in the schools. This model takes into account the features of the socio-cultural environment mentioned earlier: powerlessness, low esteem, vulnerability to disaster, etc.; it also includes consideration of their effects upon individuals in the sub-culture. Therefore, it seems likely that all models of deprivation must ultimately include the effects of social structure upon individual cognitive behavior and the need to modify that structure if intervention techniques are to succeed.

Interaction between Social Structure and Child

Let me briefly review current ideas about the processes linking social structure to child-rearing practices. First, a popular view is that there is a functional tie between economic activities and child-rearing practices of adults, either directly or through the salience of values rewarded on the job and, therefore, in the home. For example, Kohn (1963), in interpreting the relationship between social class and parental values, suggests three basic differences between middle and working classes, over and above the differences in income, prestige, and security. One is that middle-class occupations are likely to deal with symbols, ideas, and interpersonal relations, while working-class jobs entail manipulation of things. Second, middle-class occupations permit and may demand policy making, self-direction and autonomy; working-class occupations are more likely to be supervised, administered and routinized. Third, success on the job for the middle-class is likely to be the result of one's own initiative and skill, while success or advancement in rank or wages for the working-class person is more frequently tied to group efforts, particularly the union's. The significant axis, for Kohn, is self-direction vs. compliance to rules of others. These values and patterns of response appear in the techniques of control exercised by parents over children, in the parents' judgment of characteristics as ideal or undesirable, and in their orientation toward external demands rather than inner subjective states.

These linkages between the social and occupational structure and child-rearing are formulated in a similar fashion by Inkeles (1960). In his view, the emerging industrial society brought with it a role-structure that demanded and presumably rewarded patterns of behavior appropriate (and in this sense necessary) to industrial occupations, including acceptance of an authority hierarchy, standardization and order, regard for time, and cooperative activity. This pattern of connection between the job and parental values is bolstered by other social class differentiations, especially level of education which gives middle-class parents more facility in dealing with ideas and verbalizing motives. A later paper (Inkeles, 1966) extends the model of socialization toward adult roles beyond the occupational and industrial arenas to the development of competence for social roles throughout the society.

Although Inkeles' formulations emphasize the outcomes of socialization rather than the process, they provide an orientation for considering social class and ethnic differences in both. If society demands differentiated roles, individuals must be trained to fill them. While it may be difficult to accept the assumption that parents are intentionally acting in service of the total system, it seems likely that the availability of roles and the visibility of established statuses and positions in the occupational and social structure do make children and adolescents aware of the possibilities. Moreover, the school system and, to a degree, parents' attempt to provide training oriented toward roles in the system. In part, the process is a matter of practicality; children are oriented toward visible opportunities in the economy. In part, however, it is mediated by values developed in different segments of the society. Dissimilar experiences at unequal positions in the socio-cultural system will lead to differences in values, differences in socializing efforts, and differences in socialization.

Another way the social system affects individual behavior is through the individual's growing awareness of his relative position in the hierarchy and of the prestige and opportunities available in the society at large for persons who possess his characteristics and live in his community. Mead, Cooley, and others in sociological tradition have pointed out that self-concept arises in part from the expectations, attitudes and behavior of others. Self-concept and an awareness of one's position come from observation and impersonal sources and from specific experiences, particularly within the family. The resulting self-concept in turn affects the quality of the individual's performance, attitudes, and values. The work of Katz and his associates, for example, suggests that perception of inferiority appears to lower performance (Katz, Goldston, & Benjamin, 1958; Katz & Cohen, 1962). This happens through an expectation of low performance and possibly through a desire not to risk the disapproval of a high-status person by appearing to equal or surpass him. An attempt to alter the status positions in such face-to-face relationships would be interpreted as aggressive.

Low self-esteem may affect the performance of parental roles in various ways. Perhaps, as McKinley (1964) argues, low status in occupational areas creates frustrations that fathers are likely to express in aggressive or stern behavior at home. It may also appear in tendencies to restrict the initiative and assertive behavior of children, or it may be transmitted as a more diffuse sense of depression and inability to cope with environmental problems.

A third suggested route of transmission for social class differences is through traditional cultural and religious values that lead to different types of child-rearing practices. The prestige and position of ethnic minorities in the society is, of course, one aspect of the social structure. To the extent that immigration brought ethnic groups who entered the occupational system at working class levels and who, to a great extent, remained there, these ethnic influences operate to perpetuate social class patterns of child-rearing and performance. Differences in values of ethnic groups have been regarded as relevant for differential achievement (Strodtbeck, 1958; Rosen, 1959), although our information about the extent to which this operates throughout the country is limited. For the American Indians, the ethnic and cultural differences are compounded by isolation, powerlessness, and low esteem, producing patterns of behavior and adaptation dramatically incongruous with the norms of our society.

A fourth conceptualization of the mechanisms of transfer between social structure and behavior is emerging from the formulations and research of Bernstein (1961, 1962 a & b, 1964) and in my work. In this view, the child is socialized into modes of communication and strategies of thought that develop in response to specific interactions with salient adults, especially the mother. Adaptive consequences developed by the mother are transmitted through her linguistic modes, regulatory strategies, cognitive styles, and self-esteem. These early modes of dealing with the child induce similar adaptive consequences in the child.

This type of socialization is not a direct teaching of valued behavior, as formulations of linkages to occupational experiences argue, but emerges from the child's responses to parental behavior, which itself is linked to social structure. It is not that the low-status child is taught to be passive; rather, the unpredictability of his life and the lack of orderly contingencies in his experience with his environment induce caution and apathy. The sense of powerlessness and of lack of alternatives for thought and action that adults in the environment experience are not transmitted as values but expressed through styles of behavior that induce corresponding responses in the child. Mothers in slum areas, for example, orient their children toward the public school in terms of the problems of dealing with the authority system of the school rather than in terms of problems of learning. This follows in part from the mother's sense of inefficacy in relation to the school, from her expectation (or fear) of failure, and from the prolonged experience in the community and at work, of being acted upon rather than acting. The responses in children are either compliance to the system or resistance of it through social behavior, either violent or evasive (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960).[7]

---

[7] This view of the interaction between the cultural system and individual adaptive behavior derives from the formulations of Davis on the effects of experience in social class environments (Davis, 1948).

It should be clear that these several theories about the processes linking social structure to child-rearing practices relate to all implicit models of "deprivation" and should be considered when planning intervention programs. To restrict change to only one facet of the complex, dynamic interrelationships between society and children's behavior is to court failure. We must understand the strength and significance of forces now at work in shaping behavior if we are not to waste our efforts and our money in attempts to alleviate disadvantage.

Governmental Intervention in Family Life

However worthwhile their stated objectives, intervention programs designed to alter the relationships and interaction between parents and children may have unintended long-term consequences. Both a word of caution and an attempt to anticipate some of those long-term effects on family life and the role of family in society therefore seem to be in order. These comments should be understood not as predictions but as possibilities to be taken into account in program planning.

There are limitations, clearly, to what a program can accomplish by working directly and solely with families. If, as has been argued in this paper, an impoverished environment affects the child directly as well as through his interaction with adults or other agents of socialization, it follows that working with the family alone will have a limited influence on the child. Also, if it is true that the family is the chief mediator between child and environment, attempts to change the family may be counteracted by the social and environmental pressures that brought working-class families to their present state. The influence the family exerts on the child is a result of many pressures on the family itself that originate in the conditions of the society. Perhaps changes within the family, if they can be effected despite conflicting pressures, can in the long run produce changes in the social and cultural environment. But it should be recognized that changes in the family may be difficult to bring about unless they are supported by programs of wider social and economic reform. Programs of intervention may make it possible for individual children and their families to move out of the slums--a worthwhile goal in itself, but one that does not touch the needs of enough people. A large segment of society needs the assistance that intervention programs are designed to offer.

Parent involvement programs are usually designed for young children, but intervention programs for parents of small children will not necessarily assist the parents with children who are past the fourth or fifth grade. The parents' effectiveness, even after intervention, may be limited to the early grades by their own limited schooling. And if the programs _are_ effective, the children will surpass their parents. What are the consequences for a child who realizes by grade 5 or 6 that his father cannot help him with his school work? What happens to the parents' prestige and to their effectiveness as models for the child? What are the consequences for family solidarity and the parents' potential as socializing agents? The possibility presents itself that our programs may in the long run promote the generation conflict between child and parent.

The family and the school are the two major socializing agents in American society. There are signs that the impact of the school is becoming greater and that the role of the family as an institution of the society is declining. Whether they intend to or not, intervention programs like Head Start and early education programs organized by the schools with government support affect the balance of power between these two major socializing agents. As the school is assigned more time in the child's life and more responsibility for teaching him when he is young, the significance of the family must necessarily decrease. It has been noted by sociologists that the role of the family as an economic, educational, social, and procreational unit has declined considerably over the past hundred years. Its functions may now become even narrower as a result of government programs.

In the past there has been a fairly clear differentiation between the responsibilities of family and school. The family has been responsible for procreation and economic support, and also for the child's personality development, particularly with regard to impulse control, emotional growth, moral development, and the inculcation of values. Although there is some consensus within the society on these norms, there is considerable room for individual variation from family to family with respect to the content of values and behavior, techniques for transmitting them, choice of a time in the child's life at which to teach values and other non-academic behavior, and so on.

As the school reaches more and more of the child's life in the early years this differentiation is less clear. The distinction between cognitive and emotional growth that can be made in the public school curricula is not so easily made at the preschool level. In the preschool years there is a greater mingling of emotional, cognitive, social, and moral behavior in the child. In early intervention programs the school not only takes more of the child's time but becomes involved in a much wider range of significant behavior. As the teacher, playing the role of child-care expert, becomes more and more involved with the mother and the child, the traditional differentiation between the roles of mother and teacher becomes blurred. If teacher's social status, education, sponsorship, and apparent expertise make her the expert when roles overlap, what does this do to the mother, the child, and the institution of the family?

It could be argued that middle-class mothers have been using the nursery school for some time without apparent damage to the family. However, middle-class mothers and teachers are roughly equal in education, training, background, and social status, and the mother is free to turn to other resources (the mass media, literature, neighbors) for information about specific issues and in other ways to exercise her own initiative and control her impact on the child. The lower-class mother, however, is currently below the teacher in status, etc. and may be required to cooperate with intervention programs as a condition for her child's participation. She is likely to be intimidated by the prestige and influence of the school and to feel that the teacher and the parent intervention program, by teaching her the "right" way to work with her child, mean that the way she has been doing it is wrong. Since expertise in one area has a way of spreading into adjacent areas, mothers tend to turn to teachers for assistance in areas not related to the specific program objectives. Although the information or advice the mother receives may well be helpful, there is a danger that the process of getting it will lock the mother into a suppliant role. Even if she rejects this role her relatively subordinate place in the social structure of the community and society makes it difficult for her to resist indirect influence of the school.

A program that places the mother in a subordinate and independent position seems likely to encourage either dependence on and compliance with school or frustration and rebellion. The latter might arise in several ways: the mother may resist a dependent relationship with the teacher, for example, or her dependence may for one reason or another not be honored. An obvious problem is that the change of teachers from one year to another as the child moves through school will bring the mother into contact with teachers who are quite different in their ability to deal with her and the problems of her child, introducing discontinuity and its possible frustration into the relationship.

It seems likely the school will become more nearly the exclusive socializing agent in the society and thus that the school will play a larger role relative to that of other socializing agents, in the lives of children and adolescents. There are, of course, ways to counterbalance this tendency. Indeed, the growth of community schools and the emergence of parent power in opposition to schools may indicate not only a desire for better schools but resistance to their increasing influence.

The difficulty that communities have when they try to change the school system testifies to the inertia of a large bureaucratic system. If programs of parent intervention are developed and incorporated into the public schools, they probably will not be able to resist the influence of bureaucratization and institutionalization.

Judging from what has happened to other large institutions, it should be expected that programs will become more homogeneous and more likely to be established and controlled from outside the classroom. Tactics and techniques may be chosen on the basis of decisions made by committees, government agencies and the like, and made a part of teacher training programs. The need for individualized programs based on the requirements of individual children and groups of children (such as those from different ethnic groups) are likely to be ignored. Variety is hard to build into a large bureaucratic system such as a city school.

A related issue concerns the basis on which socialization guidelines will be determined. If programs of intervention that involve emotional and social growth are adopted by the schools, they will draw from the recommendations of experts engaged by local or national governmental agencies. There would be some question in the minds of many behavioral scientists as to whether we have enough information at the present time to justify the development of wide-scale, long-range programs of intervention in family activities at the preschool level. In any case, such a system assumes a hierarchy of talent, with the ultimate experts exerting considerable influence in teacher training programs, research policy, and curriculum and evaluation.

If intervention programs achieve their present objectives, there will be a period of change and transition in the family and the community in which Head Start and other compensatory programs are located. Whatever the relationship is between the family and the school at the present time, then, it is likely to change. Perhaps intervention programs should attempt to monitor that change and to anticipate problems that it may cause. For example, it seems essential that programs be flexible so that they can change as the relationship between the family and the school is altered. Through their effect on parents, intervention programs will also have certain consequences for the community itself. For example, mothers who get to know each other through the program and gain from it a heightened awareness of themselves in relation to the school may create community organizations to assist or combat the schools.

This effect, like some of the others I have mentioned, may be positive and necessary if we are to reach the educational goals we seek. However, long-term consequences are not typically built into programs as part of their objectives, nor are they considered and analyzed in relation to the economic, social, and political life of the community. It is of great importance to recognize that intervention programs are not a new permanent state of affairs to which we must adjust, they both initiate social change and become targets of change. So they must be built with mechanisms that permit flexible adaptations to changing pressures and needs.

FIGURE I

SUMMARY OF STUDIES OF PARENTAL INFLUENCES ON CHILDREN'S ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR

Demand for High Achievement

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1958	Moss & Kagan	"Maternal acceleration," maternal concern for child's growth and development and achievement during the child's first three years of life correlates with IQ at age three.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scale
1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Parents of boys (9-11 years) with high need achievement have higher aspirations for their sons, set standards of excellence even when they aren't part of the task, and expect their sons to do "better than average." Mothers who foster achievement training have a greater concern about the child's success and reward with approval and punish with hostility.	Observation of parents as they interacted with their sons who were performing a series of five laboratory tasks. Parental behaviors indicating these variables include parental attempts to push performance up through expressions of enthusiasm, and urging the child on. Also parents attempted to push up performance through expressing their displeasure by indicating disappointment at speed and level of performance (particularly true of mothers).

Demand for High Achievement (continued)

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1960	Crandall, Preston & Rabson	Direct maternal rewards of achievement efforts and approval-seeking were predictive of children's achievement behavior (aged 3-5 years).	In home observation of mother-child interaction, mothers were rated on their (a) affection, (b) rewarding of help-seeking behavior, (c) rewarding of emotional support-seeking, (d) rewarding approval-seeking, and (e) rewarding of achievement efforts.
1963	Kagan & Freeman	IQ for girls (ages 3-1/2, 5-1/2, and 9) were related to mothers who were acceleratory (when child was between the ages of 4 and 7) and more critical (when the child was between the ages of 2 and 4). Parents who value education reward academic competence and intellectual skills.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating. Ratings of mother in home situation when the child was between the ages of 2 and 7.
1963	Bing	Mothers of high verbal achievement children (5th grade) punish the child less for poor speech, and criticize more for poor academic performance.	Interview and questionnaire response to open-ended questions related to mother's interest in child's good speech habits, verbal freedom allowed, and emphasis on academic achievement.
		Mothers of high verbal achievement girls (5th grade) pressure their children more for achievement, and improvement.	Observation of interaction during task performance.

1963 1964	Dave Wolf	Child's (5th grade) IQ and educational achievement correlated with the parent's intellectual expectations for the child.	
1964	Crandall, et al	Positive and negative reaction of parents to child's intellectual achievement efforts were predictive of child's academic achievement (grades 2-4).	A rating of parental feelings as expressed during an interview.
1964	Katkovsky, et al	Parents' values, expectations, standards and satisfaction with performance is associated with daughter's performance in the areas of intelligence and artistic skills and for sons in the areas of physical skills and mechanical skills.	Interview A - multiple choice questionnaire where each item described a situation in which the parent could make a choice in the form of an evaluative response to his child's performance. (2-3 of the responses were positive, 2-3 negative and one neutral.) Interview B tapped the parents' own achievement behaviors in four areas (intellectual, artistic, physical, and mechanical).
1964	Rau, Mlodnosky, & Anastasiow	Children who scored high on second grade reading and arithmetic tests and on PMA and WISC mental ability tests had mothers who set achievement standards for the child.	Stanford Parent Questionnaire
1967	Honzik	Parents of opposite sex's concern for academic achievement is positively related to test scores (longitudinal).	Interview about home situation when child was 21 months. Cluster of questions related to parental attitudes and concerns.

Maximization of Verbal Interaction

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1951	Milner	Within the child's (grade 1) family there are opportunities for verbal interaction, participation in mealtime conversation, and the child can talk to his parents.	Through an interview of the mother, the mother was asked: Q. Did you say anything to each other during breakfast? What? A. Yes - conversation and/or child talking. Q. Did anyone talk to (child) while he/she was eating his/her supper? A. Yes - child participating.
1963	Bing	High verbal children (grade 5) have mothers who provide early verbal stimulation, and the child participated more in mealtime conversation.	Through an interview and questionnaire responses. Verbal stimulation includes amount of playtime mother had with child, taking child on outings, early reading to child, and tutoring child before school.
1963 1964	Dave Wolf	A child's IQ and educational achievement are positively related with the opportunities the family provide for enlarging the child's vocabulary.	
1968	Slaughter	The extent of "open communication" between mother and child (high school age) is related to the child's academic achievement and his autonomy in the school setting.	

Engagement with and Attentiveness to Child

1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Parents of high achievers (boys 9-11 years) show more involvement and are more interested in and concerned with their son's performance.	Rating of parental behavior while son was performing a series of five laboratory tasks. Interest and concern was indicated by the parents' use of specific and nonspecific directions. Specific directions included giving detailed information about how to do a task. Nonspecific directions included giving hints, clues and general suggestions.
1962	Witkin, et al	Maternal characteristics which facilitate psychological differentiation in 10-year-olds includes high involvement with the child.	As judged by the mother's responses related to her knowledge about the child's past and current adaptation to school, her sensitivity to the child's social relationships and activities, and her attitudes toward the child. "How do you feel about (child's) school progress, compared with his abilities and your hopes and expectations?"
1962	Mannino	Mothers of high school students in school (compared to drop-outs) showed more interest in child's school progress, gave more encouragement, and consulted teachers more often.	Interview of mother in home. Questions probed opinions and educational and occupational expectations of parents.

Engagement with and Attentiveness to Child (continued)

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1963	Bing	Mothers of high verbal children (5th grade) are able to recall more of the child's early accomplishments. During performance on laboratory tasks mothers provide more assistance voluntarily in the form of focusing, prompting, encouragement and approval on both the verbal and nonverbal tasks and provide help sooner when the child requests help.	Interview and questionnaire response to open-ended questions exploring the mother's past relationship with her child. Observation of mother-child interaction when the child was involved in task performance.
1963 1964	Dave Wolf	A child's IQ and educational achievement (5th grade) correlate positively with parental assistance in nonschool and school related activities and the amount of information the mother has about the child's intellectual development.	
1964	Bayley & Schaefer	In later years boys need a masculine model who achieves and is interested in and concerned with his son's achievement.	

2

Maternal Teaching Behavior

1967	Busse	A moderate amount of parental manipulation of materials was related to son's (about age 11) flexible thinking (curvilinear relationship). There was also a curvilinear relationship between a mother's use of command and pointing and a son's performance, a moderate amount was best.	Observation of parent-child interaction on a series of 4 lab tasks (Match Problems, Word Memorization, Unusual Uses, and Concept Sorting).
1967	Olim, Hess & Shipman	Children (4 years old) whose mothers employ personal-subjective and/or cognitive rational techniques in teaching her child a task score higher in IQ and on Sigel Conceptual Sort than do children whose mothers employ imperative-normative techniques. Mother's high language elaboration was asosociated with superior cognitive performance in the child.	Observation of mother teaching her child a block-sorting task.
1965-1969	Hess, Shipman	Mothers of children (4-7) with high achievement employ the following teaching strategies: She gives specific directions and feedback, She orients the child to the task, She works to elicit the child's cooperation, She gives praise, She accompanies requests for physical responses with verbal explanations. The mother's facile and complex use of language also affected the child's performance.	Observation of mother-child interaction when the mother taught her child a series of tasks which the child then performed for the experimenter.

Diffuse Intellectual Stimulation

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1945	Baldwin, Kalhorn & Breese	Families defined as Acceptant - Democratic - Indulgent provide intellectual stimulation and accelerate the child's intellectual development.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating
1951	Milner	High Scorers come from families where there are more books available and the child (grade 1) is read to more often by personally important adults.	Children were asked: Q. Do you have any books of your own? How many? A. Yes - several or a great many storybooks. Q. Who reads them to you? A. Mother and/or father.
1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Parents of boys (ages 9-11) with high need achievement give the child more things to manipulate.	Observation rating of parent-child interaction on a series of five laboratory tasks.
1962	Witkin, et al.	Maternal characteristics which foster psychological differentiation in the 10-year-old child include the stimulation of curiosity and interests.	Rated in response to the following question asked to mothers: What activities have you restricted or encouraged? As well as questions related to the mother's general attitude toward the child.
1963	Bing	Mothers of high verbal children (5th grade) bought more storybooks for their children.	In response to interview and questionnaire items related to what was provided for the child.

1963 1964	Dave Wolf	Children's (grade 5) IQ and educational attainment correlates with the extent to which parents create learning situations in the home.

Warm Affective Relationship with Child

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1945	Baldwin, Kalhorn & Breese	Families described as Acceptant - Democratic - Indulgent provide their child with emotional support and the parents exhibit warmth.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating
1950	Stewart	Mothers of high achievers (8-12 years) were more rejecting than overprotective, lack warmth and positive feelings toward child while the mothers of low achievers are more indulgent, overprotective and/or capricious than they are rejecting.	Interview - Questions not provided.
1951	Milner	In the homes of high scorers (1st grade) there are more chances for positive interaction with adults, and parents express more affection in some overt manner.	Children were asked: Q. Does your mother do things that make you like her very much? A. She takes me places with her and/or reads to me. Mother asked: Q. Did you or anyone else hug, kiss or speak approvingly to (child) yesterday?
1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Parents of boys (9-11 years) with high need achievement put out more affective acts.	Observation of parents as they interacted with their sons who performed a series of 5 lab tasks. Affective acts indicated by positive affective acts - expression of approval, giving love,

			comfort, affection and through positive tension release, jokes, laughs.
1962	Witkin, et al.	Maternal characteristics which facilitate psychological differentiation (10-year-old males) include warmth - when there is a reason and a purpose - and affection.	As judged by the mother's answer to questions related to the mother's attitude toward the child and the mother's behavior and feelings related to the physical care of the child.
1964	Bayley & Schaefer	Mothers who show affection have sons who score low on IQ tests during their 1st year of life, but make rapid gains during the 2nd and 3rd years. In early years sons need a warm, close relationship with their mother.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating
1967	Honzik	For girls, a close relationship with the mother is important when the child is young. A close relationship with the father becomes increasingly important as the girl gets older. A mother's close relationship with a son affects his verbal more than his performance score when the son is between 8 and 18.	Interview of the family relationship when the child was 21 months. A cluster of the interview included questions on the family's affectional relations, marital adjustment, close bonds, friendliness, and the expression of affection.
1967	Busse	Parental warmth and involvement relate positively to flexible thinking in boys (median age 11.3 years). For fathers, speaking more words and giving more verbal expressions of warmth were related to greater flexible thinking in sons.	Observation of parent-child interaction as they were involved in 4 laboratory tasks related to flexible thinking as defined in the Match Problem, Word Memorization, Unusual Uses Task, and Concept Sorting.

Feelings of High Regard for Child and Self

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1958	Winterbottom	Mothers of boys (ages 8 and 10) with high need achievement rated their sons more favorably in comparison with other boys.	
1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Parents of boys (ages 9-11) with high need achievement have higher regard for their son's competence.	Observation of parent behavior while son was performing a series of 5 laboratory tasks. The parent gives explicit positive evaluation of son's performance, indicates job well done.
1962	Witkin, et al.	Maternal interaction which facilitates psychological differentiation in children (age 10) includes an accepting attitude.	Judged on the basis of mother's responses to questions related to their general attitude toward the child: What do you enjoy most about (child)? What are you most proud of in child? At what age have you enjoyed (child) most? And other questions related to discipline and the child's social relations and school adaptation.
1962	Barwick & Arbuckle	High achieving boys (8th grade) perceived their fathers as more accepting of them than did low achieving boys who perceived their mothers as more accepting. Both father and mother acceptance as perceived	Porter Parental Acceptance Scale Whitesel's Situation Questionnaire for Child-Parent Relationships

		by girls related positively to achievement. Children's perception of acceptance was more significant in predicting performance than parent's statements of their acceptance of child.	Gilmore's Sentence Completion Test (Specific items were not included in the article.)
1964	Crandall, et al.	A mother's evaluation of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the child's general intellectual competence is positively related to children's academic performance (grades 2-4).	Interview. Rated on the level of competence the parent felt his child characteristically demonstrated in intellectual activities.
1967	Busse	A father's strong feelings of powerlessness was negatively related to his son's (11 years) flexible thinking.	Feelings of powerlessness were evaluated on the basis of responses on the PARI interview schedule.
1968	Slaughter	The mother's degree of social isolation related to the high school child's achievement.	
1965-1969	Hess, Shipman	A mother's attention to the external world, out-of-home activities, her feelings of optimism about the future and her feelings of effectiveness relate to the achievement of her child (4-7 years).	

Pressure for Independence and Self-Reliance

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1945	Baldwin, Kalhorn & Breese	Families of high achievers were rated as Acceptant - Democratic - Indulgent. In these families the child has freedom.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating
1958	Winterbottom	Need achievement in children (ages 8 and 10) is associated with maternal positive demands for independence. At age 8 mothers have restrictions on their sons. At age 10 they have less restrictions and expect more independence.	Winterbottom Independence Training Inventory. Parents presented with 21 goals which they were asked to (1) indicate which were the most important in the training of their child, and (2) at what age did they expect the child to master the tasks.
1959	Rosen & D'Andrade	Mothers who foster high need achievement (boys 9-11 years) expect less self-reliance, and are more dominant.	Observation of parent-child interaction while child performed 5 laboratory tasks. Maternal expectation of less self-reliance was indicated by her greater use of specific directions which would facilitate task completion rather than nonspecific directions designed to guide the child but not make him rely on the directions.
1960	Crandall, Preston & Rabson	High achieving children (3-5 years) are less dependent on adults for help and emotional support.	Observation of mother-child interaction in the home and of child in relation to other adults in the nursery school.

			Children were rated on (a) achievement efforts exhibited, (b) amount of help-seeking from adults, (c) amount of emotional support-seeking from adults, and (d) amount of approval-seeking from adults.
1961	Chance	Children (age 6) with high achievement in arithmetic and reading had mothers who were "late" in independence demands.	Mothers indicated at what age they expected their children to perform 28 different tasks. Mothers were then rated as "early" or "late" in their expectations for independence in relation to the median age estimate for all mothers.
1962	Witkin, et al.	Maternal characteristics which facilitate differentiation in children (10 years) include fostering independence (defined as encouragement of separation), encouragement of "age-adequate" responsibilities and activities.	"Maternal control in the direction of child's achieving mature goals or becoming responsible." As judged by the mother's response to questions related to her attitude toward the child, physical care of the child and the child's social relationship and activities. For example: "When did you first let (child) play alone outside?"

Pressure for Independence and Self-Reliance (continued)

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
1964	Bayley & Schaefer	Mothers who are egalitarian toward their sons and grant them autonomy have sons who are below average in IQ during the first year of life but make rapid gains during the second and third years.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating
1964	Shaw	Parents of high achievers (10th-11th grade) chose more clearly defined goals indicating more clearly defined demands; they are concerned that their child develop the ability to make his own decisions, they expect the child to be more adult in behavior at an earlier age, they expect early mastery of self-care tasks by the child, and they stress the child's responsibility to the parent.	Winterbottom Independence Training Inventory. Parents presented with 21 goals which they were asked to (1) indicate which were the most important in the training of their child, and (2) at what age did they expect the child to master the tasks.
1964	Rau, Mlodnosky & Anastasiow	High scorers had parents who made positive demands for the child's self-sufficiency and mothers who rewarded independence.	Stanford Parent Questionnaire
1967	Busse	Parental willingness to allow independent performance of a task correlated with son's (median age 11.3) performance on flexible thinking.	Observation of parent-child interaction on 4 laboratory tasks (Match Problem, Word Memorization, Unusual Uses, and Concept Sorting).
		Father's indication of flexible, sympathetic standards, related to son's flexible thinking.	Judged by father's responses to PARI items.

Clarity and Severity of Disciplinary Rules

1951	Milner	High achievers (grade 1) are subjected to controlling, preventing, and prohibiting techniques of discipline while low scorers are more liberally treated. Part of the parental role is to control and limit the child.	Children asked: Q. What makes you mad when you're at home sometimes? A. When my parents won't let me have or do what I want to have or do. Q. What things does your daddy (mother) do that make you cry or feel real bad? A. He/she won't do or give me things I want him/her to do or to give me, and he/she makes me do things I don't want to do, or won't let me do things I want to do.
1957	Kent & Davis	Children (8, 9, and 12 years old) whose parents are characterized as having demanding discipline scored higher on Binet tests.	Obtained through interview.
1957	Drews & Teahan	Mothers of high achievers were more authoritarian and restrictive. "The high achiever is a child who has a rigidly defined place within the home which he is expected to keep with docile acceptance."	Mothers were higher on the Ignoring and Dominating Scale on the Shoben Parent Attitude Survey. Some examples of the items on the scales were as follows: Ignoring - Parents are generally too busy to answer all of a child's questions. Children should be allowed to manage their affairs with little supervision from adults.

Clarity and Severity of Disciplinary Rules (continued)

DATE	INVESTIGATOR	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION WITH COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN	PARENTAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY:
			Children should not interrupt adult conversation. Dominating - A child should always believe what his parents tell him. A child should have strict discipline in order to develop a fine, strong character. Children should be allowed to make only minor decisions for themselves.
1958	Winterbottom	High need achievement is associated with more restrictions placed on sons when they are 8, but when they are 10, the mothers had less restrictive demands.	
1962	Gill & Spilka	Domination by the mother positively affects high school girls and negatively affects high school boys from Mexican/American families. Underachieving boys and achieving girls come from homes in which mothers are more dominating than the mothers of achieving boys and underachieving girls.	Shoben's Parent Attitude Survey as used by Drews and Teahan (1957).
1963	Bing	Mothers of high verbal achievers (5th grade) were more restrictive and characterized as "demanding, somewhat intrusive mothers."	Interview and questionnaire response based on questions related to maternal restrictiveness.

Use of Conceptual Rather than Arbitrary Regulatory Strategies

1963	Kagan & Freeman	Maternal justification of discipline correlates positively with IQ (ages 3-1/5, 5-1/5, and 9 years). IQ negatively correlated with restrictiveness (ages 2-4) and coerciveness.	Fels Parent Behavior Rating. Observation of mother when child was young (ages 2-7).
1964	Rau, Mlodnosky & Anastasiow	Parents of 2nd grade high reading achievers had parents who use reasoning with the child, set up contingency rewards and are restrictive. The parents are also democratic.	Stanford Parent Questionnaire
1965-1969	Hess, Shipman	Mothers of children (4-7 years) with high achievement use personal-subjective and/or cognitive rational control strategies rather than imperative/normative techniques.	Interview: What would you tell your child to prepare him for his first day of school? (The exact question needs to be given here.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, J., & Breese, F. H. Patterns of Parent Behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 58 (3) Whole No. 268.

Barwick, Janice, & Arbuckle, D. The study of the relationship between parental acceptance and the academic achievement of adolescents. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 148-151.

Bayley, N., & Schaefer, E. S. Correlations of maternal and child behaviors with the development of mental abilities: data from the Berkeley Growth Study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1964, 29, 3-79.

Becker, W. C., & Krug, R. S. The parent attitude research instrument -- a research review. Child Development, 1965, 36, 329-365.

Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. Factors in parental behavior and personality as related to problem behavior in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 107-118.

Bee, H. L. Parent-child interaction and distractibility in 9-year-old children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 175-190.

Bernstein, B. Social class and linguistic development: a theory of social learning. In. A. H. Halsey et al. (Eds.), Economy, education and society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. Pp. 288-314.

Bernstein, B. Linguistic codes, hesitation phenomena and intelligence. Language and Speech, 1962a, 5, 31-46.

Bernstein, B. Social class, linguistic codes and grammatical elements. Language and Speech, 1962b, 5, 221-240.

Bernstein, B. Elaborated and restricted codes: their social origins and some consequences. In J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Eds.), The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist Special Publication, 1964, 66, 55-69. [Reprinted in A. G. Smith (Ed.), Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966. Pp. 427-441.]

Bing, E. Effects of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. Child Development, 1963, 34, 631-648.

Bradshaw, Carol E. Relationship between maternal behavior and infant performance in environmentally disadvantaged homes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1958.

Busse, T. Child rearing correlates of flexible thinking. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967.

Chance, J. Independence training and first graders' achievements. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25(2), 149-154.

Cloward, R. A., & Elman, R. M. Poverty, injustice, and the welfare state. The Nation, Part 1, February 28, 1966, Pp. 148-151.

Cloward, R. A., & Elman, R. M. Poverty, injustice, and the welfare state. The Nation, Part 2, March 7, 1966, Pp. 264-268.

Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.

Cloward, R., & Piven, R. F. The weapon of poverty: birth of a movement. The Nation, May 8, 1967, Pp. 582-588.

Cohen, A., & Hodges, H. Characteristics of the lower-blue-collar class. Social Problems, 1963, 10(4).

Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.

Crandall, V. J., Dewey, R., Katkovsky, W., & Preston, A. Parents attitudes and behaviors and grade school children's academic achievements. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 104, 53-66.

Crandall, V. J., Preston, A., & Rabson, A. Maternal reactions and the development of independence and achievement behavior in young children. Child Development, 1960, 31, 243-251.

Dave, R. H. The identification and measurement of educational process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Davis, A. Social class influences upon learning. (The Inglis Lecture) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Drews, E. M., & Teahan, J. E. Parental attitudes and academic achievement. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1957, 13(4), 328-332.

Garfield, S. L., & Helper, M. M. Parental attitudes and socio-economic status. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 171-175.

Gewirtz, J. L. The role of stimulation in models for child development. In New Perspectives in Early Child Care, L. L. Dittman, editor. New York: Atherton, 1968, Chapter 7, (a).

Gewirtz, J. L. On designing the functional environment of the child to facilitate behavioral development. In New Perspectives in Early Child Care, L. L. Dittman, editor. New York: Atherton, 1968, Chapter 8, (b).

Gildea, M. C. L., Glidewell, J. C., & Kantor, M. E. Maternal attitudes and general adjustment in school children. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes in child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.

Gill, L., & Spilka, B. Some nonintellectual correlates of academic achievement among Mexican-American secondary school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53(3), 144-149.

Grier, W. H., & Cobbs, P. M. Black rage, New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Haase, W. Rorschach diagnosis, socio-economic class, and examiner bias. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1956.

Hess, R. D. Maternal behavior and the development of reading readiness in urban negro children. Claremont reading conference, Thirty-second yearbook, 1968, 83-99.

Hess, R. D. Social class and ethnic influences upon socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), L. Carmichael Manual of Child Psychology, (third edition). New York: Wiley (in press).

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 34, 869-886.

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Cognitive elements in maternal behavior. In J. P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, Volume I. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Maternal attitudes towards school and the role of the pupil: some social class comparisons. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Developing programs for the educationally disadvantaged. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.

Hess, R. D., & Birren, J. E. Influences of biological, psychological, and social deprivations upon learning and performance. In Perspectives on Human Deprivation: Biological, Psychological, and Sociological. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, (H.E.W.), 1968.

Hess, R. D., Shipman, V. C., Brophy, J., & Bear, R. The cognitive environments of urban preschool children. Report to Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, H.E.W., 1968.

Hess, R. D., Shipman, V. C., Brophy, J., & Bear, R. (in collaboration with A. Adelberger). The cognitive environment of urban preschool negro children: follow-up phase. Report to Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, H.E.W. To be published in 1969.

Hoffman, M. L. Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child. Child Development, 1960, 31, 129-143.

Honzik, M. P. Environmental correlates of mental growth: prediction from the family setting at 21 months. Child Development, 1967.

Hyman, H. H. The value systems of different classes. In Bendix & Lipset (Eds.), Class, status & power. Glencoe: Free Press, 1953. Pp. 426-442.

Inkeles, A. Industrial man: the relation of status to experience, perception, and value. The American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 66, 1-31.

Inkeles, A. Social structure and the socialization of competence. Harvard Educational Review, 1966, 36, 265-283.

Jennings, M., & Neimi, K. Family structure and the transmission of political values. American Political Science Review, in press.

Jensen, A. R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 1969, *39*, 1-123.

Kagan, J., & Freeman, M. Relation of childhood intelligence, maternal behaviors and social class to behavior during adolescence. *Child Development*, 1963, *34*, 899-911.

Kahl, J. A. Educational and occupational aspirations of the "common man" boys. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1953, *23*, 186-203.

Kamii, C. K., & Radin, N. L. Class differences in the socialization practices of Negro mothers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1967, *29*, 302-310.

Katkovsky, W., Preston, A., & Crandall, V. J. Parents' attitudes toward their personal achievements and toward the achievement behaviors of their children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1964, *104*, 67-82.

Katkovsky, W., Preston, A., & Crandall, V. J. Parents' achievement attitudes and their behavior with their children in achievement situations. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1964, *104*, 105-121.

Katz, I., & Cohen, M. The effects of training Negroes upon cooperative problem solving in biracial teams. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1962, *64*, 319-325.

Katz, I., Goldston, J., & Benjamin, S. Behavior and productivity in bi-racial work groups. *Human Relations*, 1958, *11*, 123-141.

Kent, M., & Davis, D. R. Discipline in the home and intellectual development. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 1957, *30*, 27-34.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and the exercise of parental authority. American Sociological Review, 1959a, *24*, 352-366.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parental values. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1959b, *64*, 337-351.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parent-child relationships: an interpretation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1963, *68*, 471-480.

Kohn, M. L., & Carroll, E. E. Social class and the allocation of parental responsibilities. *Sociometry*, 1960, *23*(4), 372-392.

Labov, W., et al. A preliminary study of the structure of English used by Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Cooperative Research Project Report No. 3091, 1968.

Lambert, W. E., & Taguchi, Y. Ethnic cleavage among young children. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, *53*, 380-382.

Lawton, D. Social class differences in language development: a study of some samples of written work. *Language and Speech*, 1963, *6*, 120-143.

Lawton, D. Social class language differences in group discussions. *Language and Speech*, 1964, *7*, 183-204.

Lewis, Hylan. Child rearing among low-income families. Human Resources Center, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Washington, D. C. 1961 [Also in L. Ferman et al. (Eds.), *Poverty in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965, Pp. 342-353.]

Loban, W. The Language of Elementary School Children. Research Monograph No. 1. Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

McKinley, D. G. *Social class and family life*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1964.

Manninno, F. V. Family factors related to school persistence. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 1962, *35*, 193-202.

Marshall, H. R. Relations between home experience and children's use of language in play interactions with peers. *Psychological Monographs*, 1961, *75*, No. 509.

Milner, E. A study of the relationship between reading readiness in grade one school children and patterns of parent-child interaction. *Child Development*, 1951, *22*(2), 95-112.

Moss, H. A., & Kagan, J. Maternal influences on early IQ scores. *Psychological Reports*, 1958, *4*, 655-661.

Olim, E. G., Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Role of mothers' language styles in mediating their preschool children's cognitive development. The School Review, 1967, *75*(4), 414-424.

Rau, L., Mlodnosky, L. B., & Anastasiow, N. Child-rearing antecedents of achievement behaviors in second grade boys. Cooperative Research Project No. 1838. Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1964.

Reiss, A. J. Social organization and socialization; variations on a theme about generations. Working paper No. 1. Center for Research on Social Organization. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1965. (Multilith.)

Riessman, F. New approaches to mental health treatment for labor and low income groups. New York: National Institude of Labor Education, Mental Health Program, 250 West 57th Street, New York, 19, New York, February 1964.

Rosen, B. C. Race, ethnicity, and the achievement syndrome. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 47-60.

Rosen, B. C. Family structure and achievement motivation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 575-585.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Schaefer, E. S., & Bell, R. Q. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 1958, 29, 339-361.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. Social class and modes of communication. American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 60, 329-338. [Reprinted in A. G. Smith (Ed.), Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, 1966. Pp. 442-455.]

Schramm, W., Lyle, J., & Parker, E. B. Television in the lives of our children. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Shaw, Merville C. Note on parent attitudes toward independence training and the academic achievement of their children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55(6), 371-374.

Slaughter, Diana T. Maternal antecedents of the academic achievement behavior of negro Head Start children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1968.

Sontag, L. W., Baker, C. T., & Nelson, V. L. Mental growth and personality development: a longitudinal study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1958, 23, No. 2 (Serial No. 68).

Stewart, R. S. Personality maladjustment and reading achievement. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1950, 20, 410-417.

Straus, M. A. Communication, creativity, and problem solving ability of middle and working class families in three societies. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 417-431.

Strodtbeck, F. L. Family interaction, values, and achievement. In D. C. McClelland, A. L. Baldwin, U. Bronfenbrenner, and F. L. Strodtbeck, Talent and Society, Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Sudnow, D. Dead on arrival. Transaction, 1957, 5, 36-43.

Whyte, W. F. Street corner society; the social structure of an Italian slum. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, ed. 2, 1955.

Winterbottom, M. R. The relation of need for achievement to learning experiences in independence and mastery. In J. W. Atkinson, Motives in Fantasy, Action, and Society, Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Witkin, H. A. et al. Psychological differentiation: studies of development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Wolf, R. M. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Zuckerman, M., Barret, B. H., & Bragiel, R. M. The parental attitudes of parents of child guidance cases: I. Comparisons with normals, investigations of socioeconomic and family constellation factors, and relations to parents' reactions to the clinics. Child Development, 1960, 31, 401-417.

Zunich, M. Relationship between maternal behavior and attitudes toward children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 100, 155-165.

DEVELOPING PARENT POWER

Ira J. Gordon, Director
Institute for Development of Human Resources
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

I see my task as commenting on the preceeding paper and expanding some of the ideas further.

First, I would like to look at the list of parental behaviors or factors that influence the child's development in another way. Factors influencing both cognitive and emotional development of children can be included in the three main categories presented in Table 1: demographic factors, parental-cognitive factors, and parental-emotional factors.

Six demographic factors which affect children's growth have been isolated by a variety of people. The first is degree of crowding in the home. The second is ethnic membership in a group; third is the presence or absence of the father; fourth is the quality of housing, fifth is level of income; and sixth is social class. While it is clear that social class has to do with development, the problem is to discover what this means in terms of linkages and of the specific mediating variables.

The second set are items referred to as parental cognitive factors--most of these are maternal. They were derived from interview schedules, surveys and self-reports; seldom has observation been utilized. Some of these, including the variable listed by Freeberg and Payne, (1967), are obtained by asking middle-class parents, "What do you think makes the difference in the intellectual development of children?" Some of them come out of the work done by Dr. Bloom's students at Chicago, especially the Wolf (1963) technique now being used at the University of Arizona Follow Through project and which we are also using which seems to be an interesting way to examine a number of cognitive variables.

The first of these variables is academic guidance by parents. The amount of academic guidance a family gives to a child seems to make a difference. The problem here, of course, is that the rich get richer. Dr. Hess remarked that it may be feasible to teach parents to work with children in kindergarten, first and second grade level, but that parents who have not completed fourth grade cannot so easily be prepared to provide academic tutoring to the child who is in eighth grade? Many lower-class parents have high aspirations for their children and want them to go on to college, but do not have a clear idea of what is involved in this kind of decision making or how to provide substance to back up the expectation.

Second (and certainly here is an area where Dr. Hess and Dr. Shipman themselves have contributed notably) is the cognitive operational level and style of the mother.

The third is the number and type of cultural activities planned. The relevance of this variable shows up in Deutsch's deprivation index in New York City and in comparisons between Pueblo, Navajo, and the Spanish speaking Americans in New Mexico on Garber's modification of the Wolf scale (1964). The way this is managed is important too. What activities do families do together? Do they do it impulsively or do they say, "This Saturday we will go to the zoo?"

Fourth in this list, and the one that I am most concerned with, is the direct instruction of the child. Do the parents see themselves as teachers of the child? Now all parents are teachers of children, but do they teach school relevant tasks consciously and do they set out deliberately to engage in direct instruction of the child? I have been intrigued by the work that Smilansky reports from Israel on the very interesting study of pre-school children's ability to engage in socio-dramatic play (Smilansky, 1968).

This ability relates clearly to whether the Jewish mothers behave like European Jewish mothers; who see themselves as instructors of their children; the Jewish mothers who come from Arab lands do not necessarily have this image of their role. Smilansky reports that there is no difference in the affectional climate in these homes. Both sets of parents love their children and demonstrate this in a variety of ways. The difference appears in the ways they communicate in their teaching activities. One example might be how a child learns to tie his shoes. In the "Jewish mother" fashion, when the child does not know, mama says, "Climb on my lap, and I'll teach you how to do it. You take your shoe laces and you go like this," and she goes through the process, very much in the programed instruction, small steps fashion, with a good deal of positive reinforcement, and warmth, accompanying the act. The other mother, in effect, says, "Tie your shoes," or "Get your shoes tied before you go to school." That is the extent of instruction and the shoes may or may not get tied. It is the child's problem to figure out how. This leaves a great deal up to the child but it is really not independence training. It is lack of anything positive at all. Direction instruction seems an important area. This parallels in some ways Hess's findings about the variations in teaching styles by lower-class Chicago mothers.

The fifth is educational aspirations. How far do the parents expect the child to go in school? How well do they expect him to do in school? Aspirations relate to both grade level and achievement.

The sixth variable is the mother's use of available resources. This also parallels one of the items Dr. Hess examined in his four groups in Chicago. Do they take advantage of nursery school, kindergarten and Head Start? Having a resource available does not necessarily mean that it will be utilized. An important question to ask is, how well does a family seek out and use community resources even when they exist?

The intellectual climate of the home is the seventh cluster. Are there books present? The presence of books and magazines correlates positively with reading achievement, for example.

Verbal facility is the eighth factor. The work of Bernstein and that of Hess and Shipman point this out as a rather important variable.

And last of these cognitive factors is verbal frequency. Deutsch and a number of other people have described this behavior. Bing (1963) examined it in relation to sex differences. John and Goldstein (1964) comment on it as a feature of table conversation for example. Perhaps sitting together for dinner is more important than the conversation, but nevertheless the opportunities for verbal interchange and the amount of language in the home relate to the child's language development.

The last set of variables are parents' emotional factors. The first item is consistency of behavioral management. How consistent is the individual who deals with the child? Is the child able to predict order and sequence or, to use one of Dr. Hess's terms, are the contingencies absent? How much are the parents involved in providing consistent management and a stable climate?

Along with this is the second variable, the differentiation of self of the mother. Pavenstedt's description of the mother in disorganized homes in South Boston, Dr. Hess's descriptions of the mothers in his study illustrate the inability of the mother to put herself in the child's place and realize what kind of direction he needs. To this mother, the child is simply an extension of herself, she cannot understand when her feelings and his feelings can be looked at differently. Both Pavenstedt and Hess seem to be describing a mother who is at a Piagetian pre-operational stage of development; she is still at the egocentric stage.

In terms of cognitive differentiation, she cannot understand that life looks different from where someone else sits. If the parent in effect is a 4-year-old child, how can the cognitive development of a child left in such a home without other kinds of intervention move very much beyond where the mother is? I think this also raises interesting questions when we talk about involving parents in decision-making. How can a parent functioning as above be involved? How can she be helped to contribute? What can she contribute?

Third, in describing disciplinary pattern, reference is made to conflicts between various people. In the homes in which we are working we have grandmothers, older siblings, fathers, uncles, and miscellaneous assorted neighbors who play critical roles. It is one thing to grow up in a culture which provides multiple mothering; it is another thing to have that multiple mothering have some kind of unanimity or agreement about it. The problem here would be: are the people giving the child the same or conflicting messages? Related to this is the question, what do you do to the father's role image when you involve him in being the teacher of a pre-schooler? We discovered that in some of our homes the mother was willing to go along with what we are attempting to do, but the father thought it was nonsense. The child got the double message. The father can play that role in many ways. If either parent does, we are no longer welcome in that home. Sometimes we intrude, especially those of us who are psychologists, without the advantage of anthropological knowledge and try to manipulate or change cultural elements without knowing what we are doing. We may intrude in this area of discipline and create conflicts between the various family members as to how a boy should look, what should be expected of him and what role he should be playing.

The _fourth_ variable is the emotional security and self-esteem of the mother. This relates to Dr. Hess's point of whether the mother has a high regard for herself. If she doesn't, how can she create a child who will have high self-esteem?

The other variables are impulsivity, belief in internal vs. external control, which relates to the power-powerless dimension which Dr. Hess mentioned; protectiveness of the child, attitude of trust toward the society, to devote time to the child, and whether parental work habits provide some sort of order, sequence and stability in the child's life. All of these seem to be related to both the intellectual and personality development of the child.

The bulk of studies have focused on the category of parental cognitive factors. University research projects, such as ours, have not done anything with the demographic factors except to try to draw on samples so that they represent these elements. Intervention to manipulate these factors, to change housing, to change income, to change the sense of power, to do any of these, has been largely ignored in university projects and by large school system programs. Worse than that, researchers and appliers have recognized the existence of these factors and have chosen, implicitly or explicitly not to deal with them.

Let us now look at Hess' models and see what implications they have for parental involvement. There seem to be four levels at which we have presently involved parents in compensatory education. These will relate very closely to the models that Dr. Hess has sketched for us. The first level is classical welfare. This is the level where we see ourselves as missionaries; parents should either be an audience getting a message and listening to the word, or they should be bystanders and observers of what it is we are doing in school. The tradition of open school week in ancient and honorable. The parent comes to school, sits in the back of the room and sees how well we do with her child. At the day care center or at the nursery she can observe what the wise professional teacher does. In this fashion, she is to learn what to do better at home, and to understand what it is the school is trying to teach her child. The basic assumption is that the parent is a learner, and the agency representative (teacher, public health nurse, home demonstration agent, for example) is the teacher. It establishes or perpetuates a client relationship.

The second level seeks to involve the parent as a direct and active teacher of her own child. We need to raise such questions as: What is it we will ask her to teach? Who decides what ought to be taught? What is the right curriculum for teaching one's own child? What suggestions and changes will we try to make in what the parent is already doing?

From Table 1 we can learn a number of things. For example, we can suggest that it is a good idea to talk to your children; we do not necessarily want to control the content of what is said. But even this may violate somebody's culture. We have fathers who say, "Why should my wife talk to the baby before he is a year old? He can't talk back. There is no point to it." From the psychologist's point of view, the development of receptive language is the first step on the path. The problem is how to communicate this so that it makes any sense to somebody who does not see any immediate pay-offs from talking to the child. We ask mothers to orally label objects in the home. We ask them to point to body parts and say "this is your nose" and "these are your eyes." This may make little sense and so it is difficult for them to implement. The assumption in this type of parent education is that we (the experts) are going to help you (the parents) to change the way you are dealing with your children. We are going to make you a little more effective and teach you some techniques. We are the wise ones, and you are the ones who need this kind of orientation. This may very well be a valid assumption for some, but not for all of the so-called "disadvantaged" mothers. Our work indicates that many mothers who do not know how to interact with their babies in ways which may stimulate intellectual and language development wish to learn to do so. Indeed, we find many middle-class mothers who feel the same lack.

At the third level, parents are involved and actively enrolled in the school as aides or volunteers. As in the above categories, the major thrust at the third level is to change the parent rather than to change the school. This is illustrated by looking at parental roles within these three levels of involvement. At the first level the parental role is one of audience-bystander-observer, at the second he is the teacher of his own child, and at the third he is a volunteer or trained teacher-aide. These roles all imply that we are seeking to change the value system and behavior of the parent. Is parental participation patronizing or is it designed to provide support and skills for goals that the family already has but does not know how to achieve? Currently it is more of the former than the latter. Most of the research that has been done indicates that parents and professionals differ markedly in their attitudes about family life and children. How much interference are we engaged in when we adopt the first three levels of intervention as described here?

There is a fourth level emerging very rapidly, and this is the concept that it is the right of the parent to control the agency. Here reference is made to the school system; parental control already exists to some degree in Head Start. In a county with 90,000 people with an elective school board, eligible voters who go to the polls realize that if they take the trouble, they do have parent power. They control the school board. When these same people read in the newspaper or see on television that a group of parents in a neighborhood in New York City wish to do the same, they are horrified, and yet there may be 200,000 people in that neighborhood. They do not see that all the people in the neighborhood are asking for is the same right that rural people traditionally have had in this country, to control their own schools and their own school board. The fourth level is based on the notion that the parent is no longer simply a recipient of information or aid, no longer a receiver, but now should be in a partnership role; a relationship based upon a completely different assumption about the nature of the problem. The shift is from the family being the problem to the institution, in this case the school, being the problem. This leads us into Dr. Hess' models of deprivation.

The first of Dr. Hess' models is his Malnutrition model, the first part of which is Economically Starved. If one sees that the problem is economic starvation, then the agency responsible for such starvation is "the society at large." What is it that society then needs to do? The corrective activity is the provision of jobs. The locus of control in the provision of jobs is left, however, with the agency: the Job Corps, private enterprise, the junior college. Some sort of person other than the job seeker himself controls at least the training elements of the cure. What do we do for parents if we see this as being the problem? We develop job training and job placement activities.

The assumption somehow is that when the parent has a job something in the home will change that will positively affect the intellectual and personal development of the child. The mechanisms and the linkages are not well known. Mr. Moynihan, for example, who takes this kind of position, is dealing somewhat in mythology. Those who hold this view assume that there are intervening variables connecting job holding to child development. They make a rather simplistic assumption that the solution to the problem is simply to provide jobs. I am not opposed to people getting jobs, but I think that this does not automatically take care of whatever it is that is worrying us. As a matter of fact, there's some evidence that some of the people most involved in the riots were people who had jobs. Nobody has fully examined the nature of those jobs, how dead-end they were and where they fit into the technological hierarchy. I would identify Mr. Moynihan and the economist, Dr. Friedman, with this economic dependence model.

The second Malnutrition model is that the child lacks exposure; he has not had certain kinds of experiences. The fault lies with his family, which has not exposed him to things. The solution lies in such activities as field trips and cultural enrichment programs. Let us get all the children down to see the New York Philharmonic; this will solve the problem. The locus of control is mixed--the agency takes some responsibility and expects the family to take some responsibility. Basically the assumption here is that parental involvement means the receipt of advice: you ought to take your child to the library; you ought to take your child to the museum; you ought to let him see Bernstein on TV. We will take you along with us to teach you how to do it. The asusmption here is that the role of the parent is as a volunteer or aide in the system. A good deal of what has been done in Head Start, Title I, and in many of the Follow Through programs derive from this "lack of exposure" model. It relates to parent involvement at the first level described above.

I have combined the next two items into one. They are (1) the lack of pattern in family life, and (2) the absence of contingencies. The disorderliness that I mentioned earlier applies here.

The assumption of the intervenor like myself is that the responsible agency is the family; the family is not providing a pattern. There is an absence of contingencies in the family. But there are two quite different implications we can draw from this particular model. One is that the family cannot do it; this implies that we should get the child away from the family. This is done as early as infancy, in programs from the viewpoint of Hal Robinson and Bettye Caldwell. This is the model in pre-school and the Follow Through programs organized by such as Deutsch who did not work with families, Bereiter and Englemann who bypass the family, Sigel who works directly with the children. I do not mean that these investigators view life alike, but they certainly view it enough alike in that they do not deal with the parents. Their assumption, we might infer, is that they believe they know what the children need and how to give it to them, and that it is better to do it directly with the children.

A second quite different view is that the job is to strengthen the family, to enable the family to provide pattern and contengencies for itself. This is the basis for the Level II parent education models which train the mother to teach her child. This model still places the locus of control on "experts" for determining what should be taught, but it recognizes that the family as an agency should not be bypassed, but needs to be strengthened. People involved in this are Susan Gray at Peabody, our work at the University of Florida, Bushell at Kansas University, Weikart in the Ypsilanti public schools, and Karnes at the University of Illinois. These two divergent views are taken from the same observed family characteristics.

All of these interventions are assuming, in varying degrees, that what needs to be done with the parents and the children is to change behavior and value systems. The malnutrition model implies that children have not had enough middle-class-type vitamins.

Hess' Cultural Disparity model offers quite different implications. Cultural pluralism offers two alternatives. We can either see the goal as fostering cultural pluralism or as dealing with the difficulties that may appear because of cultural pluralism. If society adopts the latter view, one corrective activity is, "Well, if these children do not speak like everybody else speaks, the thing to do is teach them English as a second language." From this position, cultural pluralism decreases the child's ability to learn in school. The locus of remedial control resides in the school. The parents are bypassed in this operation. Nobody cares whether they do or do not want it. Nobody checks with them at all. We have a number of Title I and Title III NDEA programs, remedial reading programs and remedial English programs that derive from this interpretation of the meaning of cultural pluralism.

The other way of looking at cultural pluralism is to focus on "identity" behavior. The goal is to accentuate, capitalize on, and be proud of the pluralism, using it to enrich the culture by letting all cultural strands be themselves. The contemporary efforts in the area of Afro-American studies are good examples of ways to enhance cultural pluralism.

Perhaps an analogy to these two positions is an emphasis on individual differences. Educators have talked about individual differences of children for a long time. Most teachers have said, "Yes, every child is different, so how do we organize the schools so I can get all the children who are alike to be in the same place?" From this view, individual difference is a curse that must be overcome. But some of us say that individual differences make life worth living. In many cases we would want to enhance whatever the differences are. We can take the view that cultural pluralism, like individual differences, is a curse, and cling to the myth that America is a melting pot. Or, we can regard cultural pluralism as a blessing, and capitalize on it. Those who are working with parents as a group, offering direct instruction in values that are inherent to the people themselves, are taking this approach. We can take cultural disparity and develop two completely different sets of implications from it.

The next classification within the cultural disparity model refers to the middle-class school. Here the fault is seen as the school itself, the corrective action is to change the school, the locus of control lies within the community, parental involvement is to exercise power over the shcool. An example of this, of course, is the recent confrontation in New York City. But the best example for Head Start is the Mississippi Child Development group which was a clear utilization of parent power in handling and running one's own program.

The third main model is the Social Structure itself. Hess defines this as: there is a lack of resources, there is not enough money to go around, those who have the power get it. There is a lack of alternatives for the poor, and there is discrimination against people because either they are poor or they are black or they are Mexican. Here again the causative agency for the problem is the social structure itself. That creates a very difficult problem, because the corrective action is for the establishment to change itself. This is not easy. Speaking as a professor, it took me twenty years to because a full professor and to develop and run my own show, and I'm not inclined to turn it over to someone else tomorrow morning. Can you really expect an establishment to disestablish itself? The critical and crucial issue in the area of social structure is whether you can see the American system as open or rigid. Therefore, the locus of control is the locus of conflict, and it will stay in conflict for a considerable period of time. I think we cannot be very sanguine about it. There are people who will say, "Yes, there is a lack of resources, so we will give you a little bit; yes, there is a lack of alternatives, so we will increase them a little bit; yes, there is discrimination, so we will try to legislate against it, but otherwise do not mess up our system, leave it alone, it is the the best of all possible worlds. We will give you whatever kind of hand-outs we can work out within the system, but we are not about to really make any major changes." There are those who respond, "That is not good enough, the whole thing has got to go." Most of us are somewhere inbetween these two closed approaches. We have seen the system change, although we recognize it is a painful and sometimes slow process. I see the problem as learning how to change while preserving certain stability.

In the area of parental involvement, there must be some way to help parents learn social skills and social roles, and a way to see if this has an effect on the child. The assumption that some people make is that if the parent is able to demonstrate that he has power and influence, his child in turn will have a little higher self-esteem, feel a little more comfortable, a little more adequate, a little more able to deal with the system. To some degree, this is based on the same faith as our first model, that jobs will affect the child. Parental involvement becomes a way for parents to learn social rules and social skills so that they can modify the system. But, as I pointed out earlier, if the mother is functioning at a pre-operational level, how can she participate? The questions are: Who is going to teach the parents? Whose social rules should be learned? Which social skills? That is where the conflict comes in. The two identifiers listed in Table 2 are black power on the one hand and legislation on the other.

What I have attempted so far is to take Hess' various models and sketch out the problems and the implications. It would be naive to offer opinions as to which implications are best, particularly when some of them are not known at this point. We have seen where conflicting implications can be developed from the same model. It is obvious that, as Dr. Hess indicated, this evaluation as to what ought to be done depends to some degree on philosophical assumptions. I think all implications should be tested. Social forces themselves are dictating, through political and other means, which models will be funded, which also determines which models will be tested. Part of the problem is that these models rest upon uncertain grounds, not only politically, but scientifically and empirically.

There is a tendency by model builders (and I do not include Dr. Hess) to over-generalize and over-simplify the nature of the group they are speaking about. All schools are not alike, all people of any ethnic group are not alike, all people in any social class are not alike. Models often overlook this very simple fact of life. I do not, for example, subscribe to the notion of the culture of poverty. I believe it to be an over-simplification, ignoring regional and ethnic differences. It is easy to assume, combining two variables like black and poor, or Appalachian and white, into a single category, poor and black, Appalachian and white, that you are closer to the target. However, we have some data from our Parent Education Project I would like to share with you about mother's self-esteem that challenges this notion. This is an extremely tough variable to measure. Coleman, in his study of Equality of Educational Opportunity, rested his discussion about the self-concept of children on three questions. No matter if you sample as many as 46,000 children, three questions are not adequate. We did a little better, we used 40 questions, but did not have 46,000 subject! We developed a mother's form of our self-report scale, called "How I See Myself" (Gordon, 1968). Information is now available on a number of mothers whose children were delivered at the Health Center Hospital beginning in September 1966. Our ratio of project mothers corresponds to the population ratio of 80% black and 20% white. One factor on the scale is labeled autonomy. It consists of such items as "I like to do things by myself," "It's easy for me to organize my time," as well as items that deal with art, music, and handiwork. It seems to measure self-sufficiency in some sense. Our black mothers score significantly higher on this particular factor than do our white mothers. There are no race differences in their attitudes toward teachers and the school, general feelings about interpersonal adequacy, nor in their feelings about their own personal appearance.

We have a Follow Through Project in six communities in various parts of the United States: Yakima, Washington; Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Richmond, Virginia; Jacksonville, Florida; and Jonesboro, Arkansas. In each of these places we employ parent educators from the "disadvantaged group." Most of them are black, a few are Indian, and some are white. The parent educators are more favorably disposed to teachers and school than our mothers. They have sought jobs and are employed by the school. Even more interesting is that these Follow Through parent educators see themselves much more favorably than do our white mothers in Gainesville on autonomy, on physical appearance, as well as on the teacher-school factor; people who are employed in projects of parent education have a different view of themselves than people who are recipients of the education. Obviously, no cause-effect statement can be made. We also have scores on high school and junior college students. The black high school youngsters in the Alachua County area see themselves more favorably on the physical appearance factor--I like the way I look, I like my skin, my height, my weight, my body build, I like my hair, etc.--and on autonomy than their white counterparts do. The assumption that all blacks have a low self-concept does not hold up, at least if our scales have validity. Our mothers of both races see themselves as less physically attractive than any of the student groups.

On our measure of internal-external control, we get a different picture. We modified Rotter's scale of internal-external control to be useful down to 4th grade vocabulary level. We find that our white mothers feel that they have more internal control. That means they think they have more power over what happens to them than do our black mothers. This seems to relate to the relevance of social structure.

It is not simply an internal psychological variable, it is a fact of life. They do have more control. When I go through the grocery check-out counter, I can be dressed in disreputable clothes but the checker says "Good morning," takes my money, and thanks me for shopping at the store. The man in back of me can be dressed impeccably, but if he is black there is no good morning and no thank you. This is the social structure. What we get on the I-E scale is the reflection of reality feelings. It is a result of what has happened to them.

I would infer, therefore, that parent involvement programs in addition to working directly on the mother's self-esteem, should influence the social structure so that we get different feelings of self-worth. Both the mother's feelings and the social organization need to be seen as parts of the total behavioral system, each influencing the other.

We get quite clear sex differences in performance of the infants in our studies. We begin working with infants when they are three months of age and measure them at 12 months and again at 24 months. The main difference between experimental and control babies is found in the superiority of the experimental girls which account for differences in favor of the total experimental group. There is one very interesting aspect; the control boys exceed the experimental boys on the locomotor subscale of the Griffiths, which is the standard test we use at 12 months. We are not clear as to why this occurs. Wo do not know how much this sex difference is a function of biology, parent behavior, parent educator behavior, or our stimulation materials.

Let me shift to some general statements about research. Parent involvement projects raise serious research problems. There is usually a good deal of tension between service and research. How does one handle experimental design so that it is clear to parents which elements of a project are subject to change and which are not, when maybe those not modifiable are ones the parents most want to change? This is the problem faced by the Follow Through models. How can a model be kept "clean" if it is opened up to change by parents? The tough questions are: Who designs the program? Who controls the program? How do you reach the unreachable people? How do you change the parents and change the institution at one and the same time? How do you learn how to do research on a program while the changes are taking place?

It seems to me that we need to develop research on the process of change, rather than assuming that we know what the end result will be. The model of the physics laboratory experiment may not be the appropriate approach. We need to develop more research on the process of change. We need to examine the effect of Hess' models on the people who use them. We need to explore the effect, not only of the usual "Hawthorne" but also the one Dr. Hess pointed out, of expectancies. What chain of events do we start, and how do we live with it? How do we develop multivariate research with uncontrolled variables? How do we operationally define terms such as "Head Start" that cannot be operationally defined? If anybody thinks there is a common denominator called Head Start, they are probably wrong. Yet we talk about research on Head Start. I would suggest that every Head Start community has its own particular nuances and its own intervention model.

How do we move away from input-output kinds of research and deal with the middle--that is what is actually taking place between input and output? How do we learn how to use what has been called the second cybernetics, or automatic feedback systems that allow for change? If a program starts off with parent involvement at the audience level, but results in gains in parents' skills so that they seek to function at all levels, how do we learn how to adapt the model to accommodate that growth? We have learned from our own parent educators that this can be done. We need to be able to move parents from subjects to partners. Our parent educators were never really subjects in our research, but neither were they supervisors. Now we are trying to shift roles. In September 1966, the parent educator was supervised by graduate students. In January 1969, the parent educator in charge of a small home learning center supervises the graduate student. I suggest that we need to find more and more ways of developing this kind of change. Developing parent power requires that we deal with all elements of the problem: the family, culture disparity, and social structure, using our best intelligence to study what we do, and to study what happens as a result.

Family Factors Associated with Intellectual and Personality Behavior and Development

Home Characteristic (Home Condition, Parental Behavior, Parental Belief or Personality)	Investigators Indicating This Characteristic as Criterial																											
	Bernstein	Bing	Bronfenbrenner	Coleman	Davis & Havighurst	Deutsch et al.	Dyk & Witkin	Freeberg & Payne	Gordon, Bradshaw & Freijo	Hess & Shipman	Honzik	John & Goldstein	Kagan & Moss	Katkovsky et al.	Lesser et al.	Lynn & Sawrey	Marans & Lurie	Mischel	Moynihan	Pavenstedt et al.	Rietz & Rietz	Roll	Sears et al.	Smilansky	Strodbeck	Whiting & Child	Wolf, Dave, Garber	Wortis et al.
Demographic Factors																												
1. Crowded Homes						X			X												X							X
2. Ethnicity				X	X				X						X			X	X									
3. Father Present			X			X					X					X		X	X									
4. Housing, Quality						X																						
5. Income											X																	X
6. Social Class	X			X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X		X	X					X					
Parental Cognitive Factors																												
7. Academic Guidance								X													X						X	
8. Cognitive Operational Level, Style							X		X	X										X								
9. Cultural Activities Planned						X		X																			X	
10. Direct Instruction of Child								X													X			X			X	
11. Educational Aspirations		X			X	X		X			X												X		X		X	
12. External Resources (Nursery, Kg.)						X		X													X							
13. Intellectuality of Home (Books, etc.)		X						X													X						X	
14. Verbal Facility	X	X			X			X		X		X					X				X						X	
15. Verbal Frequency (e.g., Dinner Con.)		X				X		X	X			X									X						X	
Parent Emotional Factors																												
16. Consistency of Management																	X				X	X						X
17. Differentiation of Self							X													X								
18. Disciplinary Pattern								X	X		X											X	X			X		
19. Emotional Security, Self-esteem							X		X								X			X								X
20. Impulsivity																				X								
21. Internal Control, Belief in				X					X																X			
22. Protectiveness, Babying of Child					X								X	X									X					
23. Trusting Attitude																				X								
24. Willingness to Devote Time to Child								X																				
25. Work Habits																					X						X	

Table 2

INTERVENTION IMPLICATIONS BASED ON HESS' DEPRIVATION MODELS

DEPRIVATION MODEL	AGENCY RESPONSIBLE	CORRECTIVE ACTIVITY	LOCUS OF CONTROL	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT		IDENTIFIER
				TO AND FOR	BY FOR CHILD	
1. Malnutrition						
A. Economic Dependence	"Society"	Jobs	Agency	Job Training	Undefined	Moynihan Friedman
B. Lack of Exposure	Family	Field Trips Child Devel. Centers Special School Exposure "Enrichment"	Mixed Agency and Parent	Rec. of Advice	Volunteer, Aide	Head Start Title I Follow-Through
C. Lack of Pattern	Family	Schooling	Agency	By-passed or Observer	By-passed	Deutsch, Caldwell, Robinson, Bereiter and Engelmann, Sigel
	- - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
D. Absence of Contingencies	Family	Parent Educator	Agency	Training in Teaching Child	Direct Instruction	Gray, Gordon, Bushell, Weikart, Karnes
2. Cultural Disparity						
A. Cultural Pluralism	"Society"	"Eng. as 2nd Lang."	Agency	By-passed	By-passed	Title 1, 3, NDEA Remedial Progs.
	- - -	- - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
		Identify Behavior Afro-Amer. Studies	Group	Self	Direct Instruction in Values	Karenga, Jones

B. Middle-class Schools	"Society"	Change Society	In Conflict	Teach Social Roles & Social Skills	Model	Black Power Civil Rights Legislation

---

*1, A-D, to varying degrees, see middle class as model culture

References

Bernstein, B. Social structure, language and learning. *Educational Research*, 1961, *3*, 163-176.

Bing, E. Effect of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. *Child Development*, 1963, *34*, 631-648.

Bloom, B. *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, B., Davis, A., & Hess, R. *Compensatory education cultural deprivation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Bradshaw, C. E. Relationship between maternal behavior and infant performance in environmentally disadvantaged homes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The changing American child--a speculative analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1961, *17*, 6-18.

Caldwell, B. What is the optimal learning environment for the young child? *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1967, *37*, 8-21.

Caldwell, B., & Richmond, J. The Children's Center--a microcosmic health, educational and welfare unit. Progress Report, Children's Center, Syracuse University, March 1, 1967. Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Coleman, J. *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Dave, R. H. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Davis, A., & Havighurst, R. *Father of the man*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1947.

Deutsch, M., & associates. *The disadvantaged child*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Dyk, R., & Witkin, H. Family experiences related to the development of differentiation in children. *Child Development*, 1965, *30*, 21-55.

Freeberg, N. E., & Payne, D. T. Dimensions of parental practice concerned with cognitive development in the preschool child. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1967, *111*, 245-261.

Freeberg, N. E. & Payne, D. T. Parental influence on cognitive development in early childhood: A review. *Child Development*, 1967, *38*, 65-87.

Freijo, T. D., Gordon, I. J. & Bilker, L. E. Internal-external control of expectancy of reinforcement and family characteristics in disadvantaged homes. Unpublished report, Institute for Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, Gainesville, 1968.

Garber, M. Ethnicity and measures of educability. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.

Gordon, I. J. Early child stimulation through parent education. A Progress Report to the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Grant No. PHS-R-306, Gainesville, Florida, 1968.

Gordon, I. J. A test manual for the How I See Myself Scale. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, University of Florida, 1968.

Gray, S., & Klaus, R. An experimental preschool program for culturally deprived children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 887-898.

Gray, S. W., & Miller, J. O. Early experience in relation to cognitive development. Review of Educational Research, 1967, 37, 475-493.

Griffiths, R. The abilities of babies. London: University of London Press, 1954.

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869-886.

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. The cognitive environments of urban preschool children: Interim report. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1966.

Honzik, M. Environmental correlates of mental growth: Prediction from the family setting at 21 months. Child Development, 1967, 38, 337-364.

John, V., & Goldstein, L. The social context of language acquisition. The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 265-276.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. Birth to maturity, a study in psychological development. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Karnes, M., Studley, W., & Wright, W. An approach for working with parents of disadvantaged children: A pilot project. Research report, IREC, University of Illinois, August 1966, OEG-10-235, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Katkovsky, W., Crandall, V., & Good, S. Parental antecedents of children's beliefs in internal-external control of reinforcements in intellectual achievement situations. Child Development, 1967, 38, 765-776.

Lesser, G., Fifer, G., & Clark, D. Mental abilities of children from different social-class and cultural groups. Monograph Society for Research in Child Development, 1965, 30.

Lynn, D., & Sawrey, W. The effects of father-absence on Norwegian boys and girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 258-262.

Marans, A., & Lourie, R. Hypotheses regarding the effects of child-rearing patterns on the disadvantaged child. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.), The disadvantaged child. Vol. I. Seattle, Washington: Special Child Publications, 1967, 17-41.

Mischel, W. Father-absence and delay of gratification: Cross-cultural comparisons. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 116-124.

Moynihan, D. The Negro family: The case for national action. Washington, D. C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, 1965.

Pavenstedt, E. A comparison of the child-rearing environment of upper-lower and very low lower class families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35, 89-98.

Rietz, D., & Rietz, R. Linking the school with the home. In R. Orem (Ed.), Montessori for the disadvantaged. New York: Putnam, 1967. Pp. 118-134.

Roll, M. H. A study of retarded young children. In National Conference on Social Welfare, Social work practice. New York: Columbia University, 1962. Cited in E. Pavenstedt (Ed.), The drifters. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Rotter, J. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1).

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Smilansky, S. The effects of sociodramatic play on disadvantaged preschool children. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Strodbeck, F. Family interaction, values and achievement. In D. McClelland (Ed.), Talent and society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958. Pp. 138-195.

Weikart, D. P., & Lambie, D. Z. Preschool intervention through a home teaching program. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.), *The disadvantaged child*. Vol. II. Seattle, Washington, Special Child Publications, 1967.

Whiting, J., & Child, I. *Child training and personaltiy, a cross-cultural study*. New Haven: Yale University, 1953.

Wolf, R. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Wortis, H., *et al*. Child-rearing practices in a low socio-economic group. *Pediatrics*, 1963, *32*, 298-307.

ON DEVELOPING DEVELOPMENTAL FAMILIES*

Daniel R. Scheinfeld
Institute for Juvenile Research

Our problem can be stated very clearly: How can we help disadvantaged families to become autonomous developers of their own children?

It has become clear that for most disadvantaged children, one or two years of preschool experience is not sufficient to insure adequate academic achievement in the elementary grades (Hodges & Spickler, 1967; Weikert, 1966). Hence, we are moving toward strategies for changing the family milieu. The economy of this shift in emphasis seems apparent. A change in family life could affect a child not just during his preschool years, but from birth on through his entire school career. Furthermore, such a change could affect not just one child, but his older and younger siblings and those yet to be born.

It seems to me that Dr. Hess's paper has raised serious questions concerning the feasibility of such a plan. Perhaps the single most important function of his comments has been to suggest that the problems we thought we were dealing with are manifestations of much deeper problems, and the solutions we thought we were implementing are solutions to very little. I would agree with his endorsement of the proposition: "It is the structure of society which makes the lower-class family impotent as an agent of effective education." I would, in turn, suggest that the key to effective education within the family is to help the lower-class family restructure its environment and its relationship to the environment. I think it is clear that in order to bring about meaningful change, we are going to have to generate a host of new strategies, based on new insights and implemented on a massive scale. I am not in the position to offer earth-shaking syntheses, but I would like to put forth a few suggestions concerning what I consider to be minimal requirements for successful programs with disadvantaged families.

---

* Paper presented at Head Start Research Seminar #5, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1969, in conjunction with papers by Robert D. Hess (Hess, 1969) and Ira Gordon (Gordon, 1969).

Most of my argument in this paper will rest on the following proposition: Parents cannot construe the child's relationship to the world in ways that are fundamentally different from the way they construe their own relationship to the world. Hence, to change child-rearing practices effectively, one must change the parents' own experience in the world.

The required changes in child-rearing would necessitate significant shifts in family cultures, particularly a shift from a family environment in which the chief concerns of child-rearing center on external control or avoidance of trouble, to one in which the internal experience of the child and the development of competence become pivotal family concerns.[1]

This being the task, it seems ludicrous to assume that significant change in parental behavior can occur without altering the parents' experience vis-a-vis the extra-familial world.

---

[1] When we speak of changes in family culture, we are often confronted with the spectre of "middle-class" ethnocentrism and with widespread skepticism concerning "middle-class culture." I think it will be clear as this paper progresses that I am not suggesting a total remolding of a family's values. But at the same time, we have to deal with the historical hard core of our present situation; namely, that the whole world is becoming a large urban modern industrial society and that there are certain skills required to function adequately in such a technical order. I suggest, for the moment, that we throw out the concept of "middle-class" and try to ask what those skills are (see Alex Inkeles, 1966). I think we will find that there is only a partial overlap between these skill orientations and the contemporary forms of middle-class culture. In other words, I am suggesting that a shift to an emphasis on the development of competence need not result in empty cultural forms and human alienation; in fact, it has the obvious potential of resulting in just the opposite. At the same time, I would caution that it can have such negative consequences if man's inner life is neglected.

If parents are to foster competence in their children, then it would seem imperative that the parents experience competence-gaining activity in their own lives. If the parent does not really _feel_ these things at a visceral level by having gained them through actual experience, then I would suggest that there is relatively little chance for substantial change.

The remainder of this paper develops this proposition and several other propositions which I feel are crucial to effective family programs. I would first like to review a study of 45 black families living in a lower-income black neighborhood on the West Side of Chicago (Scheinfeld, 1969).

The purpose of the study was to understand differences in family milieu which would account for the fact that the children of some families did well in school whereas those of others performed poorly. Academic records were available for two or more children in every family in the study. It was therefore possible to look at the achievement average of a whole sibling group rather than at the performance of just one child in the family.

The study focused on parents' conceptual frameworks underlying child-rearing. The interviewer began by asking the parent, "What have you found over the years to be the most important things about children and about raising children?" The parent was then asked to help the interviewer make a list of all the things he or she would like to see in a 10 year old boy, e.g., "independence," "don't fight," "mannerable," etc. Next came the attributes the parent would like to see in a 10 year old girl. Great pains were taken to probe the meaning of these statements. For example, "What do you mean when you say 'obedient'?" "What would a child who wasn't obedient be like?" Definitions of "obedience" radically differentiated the achieving families from the non-achieving ones.

The interviewer then went on to ask the parent what he or she felt was the best method to get the child to be one way or not to be another way, and _why_ that was felt to be the best method. The parent's explanation of why one method was better than another began to reveal his or her concepts concerning the basic nature of children, as well as the basic function of the parental role.

The preliminary analysis of these interviews yielded the following results: Parents' aims for their children were analyzed in terms of "adaptive strategies." An adaptive strategy consists of an idea about a desirable or undesirable behavior; for example, "to be obedient," or "to stay out of gangs," along with an idea about the consequences, positive or negative, of that behavior. It is an "if... then" clause. One of the simplest ways that one can analyze an adaptive strategy of this sort is by the positive or negative signs. If both the behavior and its consequences are positive things, the family has much more likelihood of being an achieving family than if the behavior and/or consequences are negative. In other words, if a parent says, "A child should know how to read good because then he'll get interested in things" (positive-positive), he or she is more likely to have achieving children than the parent who says, "A child should know how to read good because then he'll stay out of trouble" (positive-negative), or "Don't hang out with bad boys because if you do you'll get into trouble" (negative-negative).

In general, when these adaptive strategies were placed on a continuum ranging from active engagement with the environment to avoidance of the environment, the more the parents' ideas clustered at the "active engagement" end, the more likely the children of that family were to be doing well in school. The closer the parents' ideas were to the "avoidance" end of the continuum, the more likely the children were to be doing very poorly in school.

The single best predictor of children's achievement was a dimension called competence-gaining activity, defined as "active engagement with the environment in which the child is effective and is gaining greater effectiveness." If a parent's child-rearing aims were scored heavily on this dimension, one could almost be certain that the children of that family were doing well in school. A low score on this dimension almost entirely precluded high achievement.

Parental theories concerning child-rearing methods and the nature of children also differentiated achieving and non-achieving families. The achieving parents had what could be called an exchange theory of child-rearing. The child was viewed somewhat as an input-output mechanism. In order to get the desired results from a child, these parents felt you had to be attentive and affectionate, and tend to many of the child's felt material needs. They believed that, if the child is neglected, the resultant negative feelings would propel him into the street culture and a whole syndrome of undesirable behavior. Hence, the parent-child relationship was perceived as the key competitor with the street world. These parents also tended to construe themselves as having enough knowledge to be able to instruct the child concerning adaptive and maladaptive behavior. They felt that they knew enough about life for the child to be able to benefit from the relationship with them.

In their own relationship to the environment, parents of achievers also tended to be different from those of non-achievers. These parents felt a relationship of connectedness and exchange with their environment. "I've got to have my connections; I've got to maintain connections with all sorts of people 'cause I'll need them; I'll need what help I can get from them or what I can find out from them." "If I stop and help someone with their car..., I know that's gonna come back to me. It won't be the same person, but it will come back." They also tended to have a greater sense of continuity with the past and with people from the past. This was related to their feeling that they had something valuable to pass on to their children.

I believe that this study supports the basic proposition in several ways. First, the adaptive strategies embodied in the parents' aims for their children reflect distinct orientations toward the environment and, indeed, parallel the parents' feelings concerning their own adaptation to the world. Second, an exchange theory about the parent-child relationship (in contrast to a dominance-fear theory) would seem quite clearly to reflect parental experiences of rewarding exchange with people outside of the family, past and present. Finally, the parent's confidence in his or her own ability to help the child interpret reality in an adaptive manner would seem to come from a good deal of successful adaptation in his or her own life.

I think that these data strongly suggest that a program which tries to deal with the parent-child relationship in isolation from the rest of the parental experience is likely to be severely limited in its effects.

I would now like to take a somewhat broader perspective and propose that a model for helping disadvantaged families to develop their children should meet at least seven criteria, only one of which is the above stated proposition. First, in order to be practical, the model should involve a method which can be carried out by a substantial number of change agents, not just a few specially gifted or highly trained workers. Second, the whole family should be involved in the change process. Third, change should be effected within the context of the parents' own system of values and beliefs. Fourth, the basic change process should involve concrete activities rather than lectures or discussions. Fifth, the program should provide extra-familial experience for the parent which parallels the kind of experience one wishes the parent to foster in the child. Sixth, there should be a spread-of-effect process built into the model so that the impact made upon one family can be systematically spread to other families with whom that family comes into contact. Seventh, the program should develop a system of community supports which will help sustain families in their growth over time. In other words, the program should create a developmental community. I would hypothesize that change in the culture of one family can only be as effective as the community support for that change.

This sounds like a tall order, but it can be done. In my opinion, the application of these seven principles constitutes the minimal formula for effective change. It can also be construed as a very positive step in the direction of the kinds of total structural changes referred to in Dr. Hess's paper.

In order to deal concretely with this seven-point model, I would like to turn to a family project carried out at the Martin Luther King Family Center in Chicago (Scheinfeld, Bowles, Tuck & Gold, 1969; Bowles, 1969; Tuck, 1969). An analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, and accidental discoveries of this project plays an important role in my overall argument.

The Martin Luther King Family Center (formerly the Henry Horner Preschool Center) serves a lower-income black housing project community on the West Side of Chicago. The project which I shall describe was carried out from October, 1967 to June, 1968. At that time, the children attending the nursery school were divided into three tracks: A, B, and C. The "C" track consisted of children who, on the basis of clinical observations, were judged to be the least integrated, the least able to relate to adults or peers, and the least able to integrate elements in the material world (Hirsch & Borowitz, 1968; Costello, 1969). In other words, they were the weaker egos. There were 15 such children in the school. The project started with the families of six of these children.

The project was carried out in three phases. In the first phase, a black female worker (Bowles) went to the home to interview the mother. On another occasion, a black male worker (Tuck) interviewed the father. The interview was similar to the one in the previously described family study. The worker explained that the nursery school wanted to cooperate closely with the parent in helping to develop the kind of child he or she wanted to have.

The worker elicited the parent's child-rearing aims and discussed them in some depth with the parent. This interview established rapport with the parent, communicated respect for the parent's own ideas, and provided valuable baseline data for evaluational purposes.

We then analyzed the interviews and picked out those elements in the parent's idea system which overlapped with the goals of the nursery school. We found that every parent had mentioned at least one aim which was essentially developmental. It might have been as narrow as, "I want him to know his address," but if a parent wants a child to learn his address, this requires learning about numbers.

In phase two, the two workers returned to the respective parents with developmental toys or games corresponding to one of the child-rearing aims which that parent had stated during the initial visit. These were simple, inexpensive things--blocks, puzzles, Lotto. The worker introduced the toy or game, playing it with the parent and with the child. Other possible uses of the toy were explored. This process went on, the worker returning with other toys relating to the original aims or with new toys relating to new child-rearing aims that emerged. For the most part, the worker encouraged the parent and child to work on the activity together, making helpful comments and giving positive reinforcement to both. Soon the other siblings came around, wanting to have something, too. So we began providing them with age-appropriate toys and games. What we were doing,in a sense, was turning on the whole family, and that, to me, is one of the major keys in creating a developmental community. If you really want to alter the family milieu, give activities to everyone. It is probably most efficient to start with one child and then build laterally on sibling rivalry.

After parents had mastered four or five games, they began to construe toys as learning instruments and to borrow toys from the nursery school library. At this point we were ready to begin the third phase. I might add here that by the end of this second phase, we discovered that while most of the fathers cooperated with the program, they almost all displayed a marked resistance toward accepting the new developmental role being suggested by the worker. The business of caring for young children was largely construed to be woman's work and was experienced ambivalently. Consequently, on the suggestion of several fathers, the male workers forged the fathers into a "concerned fathers" community action group which has carried out a number of corporate activities since that time (Tuck, 1969).

The third phase, entitled "Working through the Network," involved mainly mothers and built upon pre-existing networks of trust and relatedness in order to lay the foundations for a developmental community. In an area where mistrust of one's neighbors is a predominant attitude, it is imperative to begin with those relationships in which trust is already present. The worker encouraged each of the six mothers to interview close friends in the neighborhood who also had children of pre-school age. The mothers interviewed these friends informally, but in the same spirit as they had been interviewed five months earlier by the worker. "What are all of the things that you would like to see in a 4 year old boy (girl)?" "Can you tell me why you feel that it is important for a child to be ______?" and so on.

These friendships within the neighborhood were then utilized and strengthened in the following way: each of the six mothers was provided with an ample supply of toys to disperse to friends in response to the friends' stated aims for their children. This process continued in the same way as the initial worker-parent relationship had progressed. The mothers worked with their friends, encouraged them, and provided new toys or games on a continual basis. Some mothers were more successful than others in this new role, but all succeeded to some extent. In this manner, 22 additional families were brought into the program.

The evaluation of this project, which centered mainly on the six mothers, yielded some interesting evidence concerning my main argument. At the end of the project (roughly eight months after the first visit to the six families), the six mothers were re-interviewed in the same manner as they had been at the beginning of the project. A control group of six mothers of low-competence children was also interviewed at this time. The interviews were coded on six dimensions: emphasis on competence-gaining activity, reference to the internal life of the child, reference to the importance of a sense of competence, emphasis placed on assertiveness, emphasis on parental dominance of the child, and degree to which parental role was construed as a teaching role.

The interviews reflected considerable progress on the part of five of the six mothers, but two mothers in particular showed very marked changes and scored consistently higher than the others. These were also the two mothers rated by the worker as having made the greatest progress.

Two other observations concerning these two mothers are significant. On the posttest interview, they were the only mothers who clearly and strongly emphasized the importance of a sense of competence in the child. Mother #1, for example, responded, "Have self-confidence that you can do... He should believe in himself; he needs to feel that he can do in life." Mother #2 said, "Be able to say that you can do what you want to do. It's the first step in learning, that you can't do anything unless you feel as though you can really do it."

These mothers were also the only two out of the six who had directly participated in the nursery school program; one, as a salaried general helper around the school, and the other, as president of the parents' council.

In short, the two mothers who developed the most were also the ones who had grasped the meaning of a sense of competence and who had experienced competence-gaining activity in an extra-familial context.

One could plausibly hypothesize that the mother's intuitive grasp of the importance of a sense of competence is the pivotal element in a child-rearing syndrome which fosters the development of competence in children. If the mother is able to identify with the child as a competence-gaining person, one who gains pleasure from effectance and discomfort from helplessness, then she is likely to foster activities which enhance the child's growth and to refrain from treating the child in ways that destroy or retard his development.

In the context of an action program, the overall formula would be as follows: the mother engages in competence-gaining activity, gains a sense of competence, and generally feels good about herself. She is then able to project her good feelings about herself on to the child and is also able to empathize with the child's need for competence-gaining experience. Furthermore, having a better feeling about herself allows her to be more accepting of her own feelings, and hence more accepting of the child's feelings and more aware of the child's inner life generally. This process serves as the underpinning of major changes in child-rearing behavior (Bowles, 1969).

The question is whether a program which concentrates mainly on relationships within the family can generate the kind of process and change suggested by this formula. I think that our analysis of the two mothers in the project described above strongly suggests that, while it might be possible to achieve this change by working solely within the context of the family, one's chances of success are far greater if one also involves the parent in competence-gaining experiences vis-a-vis the wider world. In my opinion, the two mothers who experienced the outside growth in competence were the only two out of the six who could be called successful cases.

The strengths of the program I have described were several. It related to parental values, dealt with the whole family, worked through activities as well as words, gave a great deal of positive reinforcement to parent and child, and began to strengthen the community by building on parents' social networks.

But the program was deficient in at least two respects. First, while it began to lay the foundation for a developmental community, it did not actually develop one. A fourth phase had been planned to further this end, but it was not realized due to heavy rioting in the neighborhood during the spring of 1968. This fourth phase would have been called "Closing the Network." In this phase, the worker and mother would have collaborated to weld the mother's network into a group built on a new community of interests. This small group would have carried out activities and discussions relating to their children's development and also would have served as a mutual aid group, giving each other support in relation to the schools and other outside agencies. In time, these small groups, through the help of the worker, would have been joined, hypothetically, into a large community corporate entity carrying out a wide range of activities.

The second major deficiency of the program was the relative absence of competence-gaining activity for parents in the extra-familial environment. I would argue that such activity is crucial not only because it is a necessary condition for changes in the family environment, but also because effective activity is essential to the creation and maintenance of a corporate community which, in turn, supports competence development within the family. The question is, What kinds of extra-familial experiences are feasible and likely to promote changes in people?

I would say that effective exchange with the environment has at least three aspects to it: information-seeking, information-processing, and action. If parents are to be in touch with their environment, to learn to explore its potential, and to gain a sense of control, they must become information-seekers.

The parent who becomes an information-seeker is going to be more effective, and will feel more effective as a parent because he has something really significant to tell his children about the world. He is also going to encourage information-seeking in his children. Information-seeking can be verbal, visual, or both, but it is, above all, a state of mind. Information-seeking and processing can be carried out as a primary activity or as an integral part of other activities. For example, when involving parents in the nursery school, they should be trained to be observers, to ask about and think about the children, to become familiar with the methods and functioning of the school, and, finally, to put this information to use. I would suggest that there will be far more significant change in these parents than in those not encouraged to ask questions. Accounts of the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM) bear witness to the kinds of development that can take place in both parents and children when parents are in a controlling position (Levin, 1967). I would hypothesize that the CDGM experience was highly beneficial not only because parents gained a sense of effectance, but because they began to appreciate the importance of asking the relevant questions about their situation.

Programs can be set up to help parents articulate the kinds of questions they really want to ask and to help them to go about answering these questions. They might be practical questions concerning the use of public services or questions dealing with the history of black people. They could be questions about what makes people behave the way they do or how the sound gets on the phonograph record. If one can get at those questions and successfully engage people in the process of learning about the things that truly interest them, then great changes are possible in the person's orientation toward his world and toward his children. The worker or instructor can serve as a model for question-posing and for information-seeking.

Posing questions about one's world and one's relationship to the world leads to action; setting up a cooperative laundry, launching a rent strike, organizing a precinct, making educational toys for children, exploring new places and new relationships. Action almost always leads to new question-posing. It all adds up to learning how to be effective in the environment. Parents who are learning and getting intrinsic rewards from it are going to produce learning children.

At the very most, the ideas contained in this paper can be regarded as plausible hypotheses that have to be tested. With this in mind, I would like to suggest a wide-scale experiment to be carried on within Head Start or a similar system. The variables in the experiment would be four in number:

1. Nursery school experience for preschoolers.

2. Work with the family in the family environment.

3. Work with parents toward greater effectance in the extra-familial environment.

4. Establishment of a developmental community through family networks.

Each of these taken individually, plus combinations of the four, would yield a total of 15 types of programs plus a control group without treatment. Both parents and children would be studied before, during, and after the experiment.

The thinking in this paper has proceeded from the proposition that basic structural change in the lives of disadvantaged families must take place before significant changes in child-rearing will occur. I would expand that proposition to say that, in order for structural change to take place and in order for child-rearing to change, the parents themselves must take part in generating the structural change. The parents must become actively and effectively engaged with the environment. When that truly happens, the need for ameliorative institutions will be terminated.

Head Start and similar agencies have come to realize that their aim of correcting the educational deficits of disadvantaged children cannot be realized without developments within the family which parallel the nursery school experience of the child. It has become reasonably apparent that at least as much effort will have to be spent in working with parents as in working with children. If I am correct in indicating what needs to be done in order to bring about significant family change, then Head Start will have to do some radical re-thinking, re-training, and shifting of resources. Let us hope that the vested interests of any particular professional group or any particular power interest do not obstruct the greatly needed shift toward a broader strategy.

REFERENCES

Borowitz, Gene H. and J. G. Hirsch, 1968. A Developmental Typology of Disadvantaged Four Year Olds. *Research Report*. Vol. 5, No. 1, Institute for Juvenile Research.

Bowles, Dorcas, 1969. The Use of Toys in Expanding Mothers' Child-Rearing Attitudes and Skills Through a Home Teaching Program. Mimeo. Institute for Juvenile Research.

Costello, Joan, 1969. Some Approaches to Programming for Disadvantaged Preschool Children. *Research Report*. Vol. 6, No. 2, Institute for Juvenile Research.

Gordon, Ira, 1969. Parent Power. Paper presented at Head Start Research Seminar #5, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1969.

Hess, Robert D., 1969. Parental Behavior and Children's School Achievement: Their Implications for Head Start. Paper presented at Head Start Research Seminar #5, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1969.

Hodges, Walter L. and Howard H. Spickler, 1967. The Effects of Preschool Experiences on Culturally Deprived Children. *Young Children*. Vol. XXIII, No. 1, p. 23-43.

Inkeles, Alex., 1966. Social Structure and the Socialization of Competence. *Harvard Educational Review*. 36: 265-283.

Levin, Tom, 1967. Preschool Education and the Communities of the Poor. In J. Hellmuth (ed.), *Disadvantaged Child*. Seattle, Washington: Special Child Publications of the Seattle Seguin School, p. 349-406.

Scheinfeld, Daniel R., 1969. Dominance, Exchange and Achievement in a Lower-Income Black Neighborhood. Mimeo.

Scheinfeld, Daniel R., Dorcas Bowles, Samuel Tuck, and Reuven Gold. Parents' Values, Family Networks, and Family Development: Working with Disadvantaged Families. Paper presented at American Orthopsychiatric Association Meeting, New York, April 2, 1969. *Research Report*. Vol. 6, No. 9, Institute for Juvenile Research.

Tuck, Samuel, Jr., A Model for Working with Black Fathers. *Research Report*. Vol. 6, No. 11, 1969. Institute for Juvenile Research.

Weikert, D. P., 1967. Preschool Programs: Preliminary Findings. *Jour. of Spec. Educ.*, No. 1, p. 163-181.